THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VIII FEBRUARY, 1924 No. 44

EDITORIAL

THE LITURGY—REUNION—A REMARKABLE BOOK

We venture to draw special attention to the article from the Dean of Wells published below; for it goes to the root of the matter now before the Church and its Assembly, and we believe that it will be widely welcomed as pointing the way of truth and peace. The Dean begins by showing that the idea of Invocation, as applied to the Eucharist in the primitive Church, was the Scriptural one of "a naming of the Sacred Name of God by way of consecration." The earliest "form" of this Invocation was contained in the doxology with which the prayer of consecration closed; though, as the rite grew richer in meaning and association, various ways of naming the Divine Name emerged. One such way was the invoking of the Holy Ghost: but the particular prayer that the Holy Ghost might "come upon" the gifts to "change" them was an Eastern development which never found root in the West. For the Western view is that in the Eucharist it is the Lord Himself, present in His Church and speaking by His representative Minister, who makes the Bread and Wine to be His Body and Blood.

The bearing of this upon the alternative Canons which received "general approval" in the House of Clergy last November, and which were published in our December issue,* is clear. Nothing could have exceeded the spirit of courtesy and tolerance which marked the House's deliberations; but little is gained if the avoidance of controversy is made an end in itself rather than the means to setting forth the truth. Our own belief is that the House has as yet only straddled the target, and has still to hit it. And the first necessity is to be true to its own first, and unanimous, resolution—viz., *that there shall be only one revised Liturgy and not two.* For let no one be mistaken—it is not simply a question of alternative Consecration Prayers, though that is serious enough. The consequential

* The Western form of Canon is there marked (A), the "Grey Book" form B).

changes, affecting not only what the priest says, but also what the people say, in the Post-Communion, are even graver objections to the policy. The Assembly is not legislating—and has no right to legislate—for eclectic congregations of this school or that: it is legislating for the people of England when they come to the Supper of the Lord. The effect of the alternative rites, if sanctioned, would be on the one hand to stereotype congregationalism, on the other to distract the hearts and minds of simple people. We earnestly hope that there is still sufficient pastoral sense in the House of Clergy to insist that this must not be.

And in this case there can be little doubt which of the alternatives has claims upon the allegiance of the whole Church. As the Dean points out, the "Epiclesis" in the "Grey Book" form of Canon is not such as to satisfy Eastern theologians. So far as the Invocation is for a change in the gifts—which is its significance in the Eastern rites—that is not what is intended in this Canon: so far as it is for the sanctification of the worshippers, that petition has already been made at the outset of the service in the Collect for Purity. It is therefore doubly redundant.*

Before passing, however, to the other form approved by the House of Clergy, we are bound in fairness to deal with one plea advanced on behalf of the "Grey Gook" alternative. It is said that it provides a much-needed way of escape from the custom, now common, of emphasizing the Words of Institution as the "moment" of consecration by genuflexion or similar acts of homage. We ask for a candid examination of this plea, and submit the following considerations:

1. Genuflexion, or its equivalent, at the Words of Institution admits of reference to a "moment" of consecration, but certainly does not require it. In this solemn prayer and action, many clergy desire to acknowledge the mystery by which the Elements are changed and transfigured in their essential significance and meaning; and the most suitable moment at which to do this seems to be the recitation of the Lord's words of Institution. The fact that these words are also the formula of re-consecration in our Prayer-Book appears to endorse this view. At the same time, we have no wish to impose such a ceremony on others: we are glad that the Church leaves it among things "indifferent," and do not wish to see this liberty taken away.

2. If the "Grey Book" Canon were used, those who genuflect would still genuflect at the same place in the Prayer; for it would still be the most suitable place.

3. We believe that the whole question of Eucharistic

* But see Additional Note, p. 120 below.

ceremonial needs to be tackled by authority, and that any attempt to deal with it by side-winds will serve no good purpose and quite possibly do harm.

We now come to the Western form of Canon, marked (A) in our December issue. Anyone who has compared this with the original E.C.U. proposals will realize how far Dr. Darwell Stone and Dr. Kidd, representing the Anglo-Catholic group, went in making concessions to Evangelical feeling. We agree with the Dean of Wells that " if it be held that the peace of the Church and the restoration of authority and obedience in matters liturgical depend upon its acceptance," it should be welcomed. Of the points conceded, one was not regretted; another was more or less compensated for by use of words from the 1549 Canon; but a third point represented a real loss, and we hope that it will be reconsidered. We know, too, that our feeling is shared by others. The last paragraph of the E.C.U. Consecration Prayer contained the following phrase:

. . . and command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of thy holy Angel to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle, in the sight of thy divine Majesty. . . .

Few will have supposed that exactly in that form the phrase could have been accepted by the Church Assembly: but its total omission would seem unnecessary. For if the poetical words " thy holy Angel " be interpreted (as they commonly are) as a reference to our Lord's High-Priestly mediation in heaven, the phrase itself embodies an uplifting movement of thought and feeling. The cadence of the whole prayer is perfected by dwelling at the close upon Him who ever appears for us in heaven, and through whose finished work alone we have access to the Father. The verbal alteration needed to make the phrase generally acceptable should not be difficult.

Many intricate turnings still await those who tread the road of revising the Liturgy; but a great step forward will be taken when one form of revised Canon is finally approved. Inevitably there are conservative folk to whom any change at all in such hallowed prayers is distasteful. Yet there is one consideration which will perhaps go some way to meet their misgivings. It is that every phrase and word to which they have been accustomed will be used and heard in the revised Liturgy, although in a different order and with a few enrichments. For a time, no doubt, old and new will continue side by side, both being used in the same church on different occasions; but the transition to the definite adoption of the new liturgy as the normal use will be easy; and a matter which has been for years past a potent source of dissatisfaction and con-

troversy in the Church of England will have been removed from our corporate life—let us hope, for ever.

Mr. Lowther Clarke's account of Heiler's book, printed below, is not inopportune in view of the letter on Reunion addressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Metropolitans of our Communion at Christmas; for many will feel that the English Church stands for precisely that Evangelical—and (let us add) Liberal—Catholicism which Heiler envisages as the ideal for a reunited Christendom. The points in Roman Catholicism which Heiler selects for criticism—the paid Masses, the substitution of Mary's mediation for our Lord's in popular devotion, the autocracy of the Pope, the exclusive claims of scholasticism in theology—are precisely those with which English Churchmen cannot come to terms. But we believe with Heiler that despite these accretions the Gospel is still there, and that conversations like those at Malines are part of the process that will help its triumph. The excerpts from reviews which Mr. Lowther Clarke appends to his article are of especial interest, as they correspond so closely to the comments which have appeared on the Archbishop's letter. The stalwarts of various camps—Roman, Anglican, Nonconformist—have said their inevitable say; but the great bulk of those who first warmed to the Lambeth appeal three and a half years ago—the Bishop of Chelmsford and Mr. Rattenbury, no less than the Secretary of the English Church Union—have welcomed the rekindling of the vision; and we should be surprised if the Roman authorities on the Continent showed any signs of turning back. The process of disruption took three centuries; and the counter-process may well take as long: but "faithful is he that promised, who also will do it."

A word may be said as to the three points in which Heiler finds permanent truth and strength in the Roman witness:

1. Mysticism.—The fact that Miss Underhill is among the few English writers whose work Heiler has read gives us the opportunity of making the *amende honorable* for a too cursory review of her last book* in these columns. Perhaps we were unconsciously influenced by the fact that Dean Inge has so often used her books as pegs for his oft-repeated thesis that mystical religion is only at home in Protestantism. We rejoice that such an authority as Heiler should have given this statement so clear a correction.

2. Monasticism.—The astonishing growth of the Religious Life in England since the Oxford Movement may well prove one of the strongest bonds that make for ultimate Reunion.

* *The Life of the Spirit and the Life of To-day.* Methuen. 1922.

3. THE MASS.—Would, indeed, that we could say that in the English Church "controversy is stilled before its supreme value!" We do not believe in any clear-cut solution of this problem; and the Benedictine experiments in Germany show how adaptable Rome can be to popular needs. The causes of controversy at home are partly practical, partly doctrinal. The practical difficulty arises from the fact that English Church-people had become accustomed to a non-Eucharistic worship as the main service of Sunday. Habits of this kind are only slowly outgrown; but wherever people come to love the Communion, there they will find that its meanings and uses are richer than they had ever supposed. The doctrinal difficulty is that, as the Dean of Wells says, "we English folk are more apt to look upon the Holy Eucharist as a means of obtaining something from God than as a means of offering something to God." And for that the only cure is steady teaching, based on the Bible.

Last month's Book Notes in this journal contained notice of a book of quite exceptional value, entitled *Spirit and Personality*.* It is by Dr. W. C. Bishop, sometime Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Metaphysics in the University of the South. Not since his colleague, Dr. du Bose, gave us the fruits of his New Testament exegesis some years ago has American theology laid us so greatly in its debt. Taking our Lord's glorification at the Ascension as his starting-point, Dr. Bishop asks many of the questions which must have occurred to all who teach the Faith. What, for example, is the relation of the Spirit to the Living Christ? Dr. Bishop's answer is that there are degrees or stages in the glorification of the Son. The first is the Cross; the second is when "God, in and by His own eternal Spirit," assumes "the human spirit of the Son of Man into union with Himself" (p. 33). The "grace of unction" gives place to the "grace of union"; "from being 'the Christ'—the Anointed One, upon whom the Spirit rests and abides—our Lord has now become 'Christ' simply—He with whom the Spirit is identified. The Christ-*title* has now become the Christ-*Name*" (p. 36).

The chapters on the Divine Trinity and the Incarnation are marked by a penetrating analysis of Personality, which is there used as the clue through the labyrinthine ways of the Creeds and other early dogmatic formularies. We should pay no compliment to Dr. Bishop by trying to summarize his terse argu-

* Longmans. 1923. 5s. net.

ment; but its foundation is so strong, so convincing, and so fertile of ideas, that we will endeavour to give some account of that. Are we not bound to recognize in self-conscious Personality two "moments" or *foci*, which are best distinguished as "substance" and "person"—viz., (*a*) the ground or content of consciousness, its ἐξ οὗ, comprising the thoughts, feelings, volitions, etc., which succeed each other in the mental stream; and (*b*) the "self" or constitutive principle, connecting these together, through which the spirit says, "I am"? Dr. Bishop explains his point by a truly admirable illustration. He goes to that first revelation of Himself to Moses which God made in the vision of the "Burning Bush." Let him speak for himself (pp. 83 *f.*):

> Fire or flame is the age-long expression of spirit. In the "burning" or "combustion," as witnessed by Moses, two elements are to be distinguished: the bush itself, and the flame which it sustained. When we analyze the process of combustion, we find that its "ground," its "substance" (so to speak)—its "out of which" (τὸ ἐξ οὗ)—was the bush itself. The means or instrumentality of the burning (its δι' οὗ) was the flame. To the process of combustion both of these elements are necessary. It is even so, in that process or function which we call consciousness, that we are to distinguish between the "substance" and the "person." For if it is true that I realize myself, that I exercise self-consciousness, I can only do this "out of" the material furnished by my "substance" or "nature"—spiritual, psychical, or physical—and "through" or by means of my personal "self" or "ego," which reacts upon that material and claims it as its own.

A similarly apt illustration is applied to the mystery of our Lord's two Natures (pp. 131 *f.*):

> Let us suppose two vessels, one of them filled with oil, the other with alcohol. Of these two substances, one—the oil—is alight; it is burning with its own flame; the alcohol, on the other hand, is not as yet in a state of combustion. But now let us place the vessel of oil side by side with the vessel of alcohol, so that the latter substance is kindled by the former. Henceforward, then, the two will burn with a common flame. The application is obvious. These two substances correspond with the two "Natures" in our Lord. The oil, originally alight, answers to the eternal Divine nature of the Logos, as possessed of its own proper "personality." The alcohol, originally unlighted, answers to the human nature, originally impersonal, which the Divine Word, by the act of incarnation, took into union with Himself. The flame is the ultimate self-hood or "person."

The book closes with a fine and suggestive chapter on the Theology of Justification; and there is a full summary of contents. No serious student of Christian thought can afford to miss this book; and we hope that it will quickly find its way into the list of books which must be read by candidates for Ordination.

SOME RECENT DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIAN LITERATURE

II.—THE FALL OF NINEVEH

THE fate of the Assyrian Empire was an event of surpassing importance for the king of Judah and his subjects from the time of the fall of Samaria and the captivity of Israel in 722-721 B.C. onwards, and it is small matter for wonder that Nahum's whole prophecy was devoted to this theme. For the last century and a half of its existence Assyria was ruled by a series of kings, several of whom won a high reputation among their contemporaries as conquerors, and at the same time an evil name for ruthless brutality. This "terrible succession of war-lords, inaugurated by Tiglath-Pileser IV." (745-727 B.C.), as Dr. H. R. Hall says, "broke the back of the nation; their insatiable lust of universal dominion pushed them ever forward, till they strained their power to breaking-point by the attempt to rule entirely alien and distant conquests, such as Egypt, thus weakening their control over the mountain-regions immediately north of Assyria itself," while "the incessant demand for more men and more blood from their own people naturally meant speedy exhaustion even to the hardy Assyrians." Already, in fact, Sin-akhê-erib or Sennacherib (705-682 B.C.) was forced to recruit soldiers from the subject races to fill up the gaps in the ranks of the Assyrian soldiery.

A second cause of weakness was the age-long quarrel with Babylonia. From the time of the First Babylonian Dynasty (*c.* 2225-1925 B.C.) the southern kingdom appears to have been, for the most part, the dominant partner. The first trace of Assyrian independence is to be found in the treaty defining the boundaries of the kingdoms drawn up between Kara-indash I. of Babylonia and Ashur-bêl-nishêshû of Assyria in the middle of the fourteenth century. During the following century the power of Assyria gradually increased, until Tukulti-Ninurta I. of Assyria (*c.* 1250-1241 B.C.) succeeded in conquering Babylon. But forty years later the tables were turned, and about 1210 B.C. Melishipak II., king of Babylon (*c.* 1211-1196 B.C.), wrested the power from the Assyrian monarch. The next quarter of a century was marked by an Assyrian revival, which resulted in 1183 B.C. in a successful revolt of the northern kingdom against Marduk-apal-iddina (*c.* 1196-1183 B.C.), and the recovery of Assyrian independence. A century of unbroken prosperity enabled Tukulti-pal-êsharra, the Biblical Tiglath-Pileser I., king of Assyria (*c.* 1110-1100 B.C.), to crush an abortive rising

by Marduk-nâdin-akhê, king of Babylon, to invade the southern kingdom, and to capture Babylon itself, while the power of Babylonia continued to decline under a succession of weak or foreign dynasties. But Tiglath-Pileser does not seem to have made Babylonia permanently subject to his authority, and the two kingdoms lived more or less peacefully side by side for some two and a half centuries, under a succession of unimportant rulers. Then a fresh Assyrian revival set in, beginning with the conquests of Ashur-nâsir-pal III. (884-860 B.C.), in the direction of Syria, to whom was due the tradition of inhuman cruelty which stained the later annals of the Assyrian Empire. He knew no feelings of human pity, and gloried in the tortures which he inflicted on his defeated foes, mutilating and massacring with revolting cruelty the male population, and burning alive the women and children in all the cities that he took. His successor, Shulmanasharid or Shalmaneser III. (860-825 B.C.), found himself, after campaigns not altogether successful in the West, in a position to bring Babylon under his sway without much expense or labour. Two kings of Babylon in succession, Shamash-mudammik and Nabû-shum-iskhim I., had been defeated by Adad-nirâri II. of Assyria (911-890 B.C.), who showed, however, no desire to annex or even to conquer Babylonia, and the next king, Nabû-pal-iddin, had even allied himself with the enemies of Assyria. About 855 B.C., however, he was deposed, and his son who succeeded him, Marduk-zâkir-shum, being threatened by a rebellion led by his own brother, was ill-advised enough to call in Shalmaneser to aid him; the Assyrian king invaded Babylonia, and in the two campaigns of 852 and 851 B.C. drove out the rebels, but at the same time made the Babylonian king his vassal. A revolt led by the commander-in-chief against Shalmaneser III., which lasted many years and was not suppressed till six years after his son had come to the throne, enabled the southern kingdom almost immediately to endeavour once again to reassert its independence; the war lingered on for six years, when it resulted in the complete defeat of the Babylonian army at Dûr-papsukal in northern Babylonia in 812 B.C. and the annexation of the southern to the northern kingdom.

This last conquest of Babylonia, however, was followed by the gradual recovery of that kingdom side by side with a corresponding decline in the power of the Assyrian Empire. From 763 to 758 B.C. the kingdom was distracted by civil war, in the course of which Babylon revolted under Erbâ-Marduk and was successful under his successor, Nabû-shum-ishkun II. (*c.* 760-747 B.C.), in re-establishing her independence; nor did the Assyrian king make any effort to win back the authority which his predecessors had exercised for the last half-century,

during which the Babylonian throne had been vacant and the country treated as an integral part of Assyria. Tiglath-Pileser IV. (*c.* 745-727 B.C.) restored the waning fortunes of the Assyrian kingdom in a series of campaigns in the east and the north and the west, and finally in the south, where he reconquered Babylon in 728 B.C., and crowned his life's work by "taking the hands of Bêl" as King of Sumer and Accad, a title which he had claimed fifteen years before on the occasion of his first invasion and which was only now confirmed by the priests of Bêl in Babylon itself.

Unfortunately for Assyria the new king, Sin-akhê-erib, the Sennacherib of the Bible (*c.* 705-682 B.C.), was a man of such violence of character that he was led into committing the most impolitic acts; and thus it was that he raised up an implacable enemy in Elam and estranged the whole people, and especially the priests of Babylonia. While he was absent on one of his western campaigns, the king of Babylon, Marduk-apal-iddinâ, the Merodach-baladan of the Old Testament (720-710 B.C.), rose against him; but Sennacherib, immediately after his return from the siege of Hezekiah "like a caged bird" in Jerusalem, invaded the country, and in 700 B.C. drove from it the rebellious king, who fled into Elamite territory. But in 694 B.C., angered by renewed attempts on the part of Merodach-baladan to recover his lost throne, Sennacherib ravaged the Elamite shore of the Persian Gulf; of the fate of Merodach-baladan nothing is known, but this campaign was equivalent to a declaration of war against the Elamite king. The latter accepted the challenge, invaded Babylonia, and carried away captive the Assyrian king of that country, Ashur-nâdin-shum, Sennacherib's son, setting his own nominee on the throne in his stead. Sennacherib, thus cut off from Assyria, attacked Babylonia and captured the puppet king, whom he took away as a prisoner to Assyria. No sooner had he turned his back than the Babylonians (in 692 B.C.) made a certain Mushêzib-Marduk king. Sennacherib next year invaded the country, but was forced to retire, in spite of the great victory which he claimed, and which seems really to have been a defeat. But in 689 B.C. he was able to take vengeance on the Babylonians; suddenly advancing, he seized the capital, and, after sending away Mushêzib-Marduk into captivity in company with the image of the god Marduk himself, burnt it to the ground. Ashur-akh-iddin, or, as the Hebrews called him, Esarhaddon (682-669 B.C.), in conformity with his policy of conciliating the Babylonians, in 680 B.C. rebuilt their capital and restored its former inhabitants to their ancient home. But his policy was of no avail; the long-standing enmity of the two races could not so easily be

placated, and in 652 B.C. Shamash-shum-ukîn, the vassal king of Babylonia (668-648 B.C.) and brother of Ashur-bâni-pal, king of Assyria (669-626 B.C.), was induced to rebel against his overlord, aided by a general conspiracy among the chief feudatory states from Elam to Judah and Phœnicia. The prompt action, however, of the Assyrian king led to the speedy suppression of the revolt, and Shamash-shum-ukîn set fire to his palace and perished in the flames; thereupon Ashur-bâni-pal himself "took the hands of Bel" and ascended the Babylonian throne under the name of Kandalânu.

But the continual wars were draining the resources of Assyria, while the Scythian invasion yet further weakened her, and the Babylonians were at last to realize "the vain dream of reducing Assyria to obedience to her old master," which, as Dr. Hall says, had been given up when Tiglath-Pileser I. had taken Babylon. At the time of Ashur-bâni-pal's death in 626 B.C., the Medes under Uvakhshatra, whom the Greeks called Kyaxares, and the *Umman-manda* or mixed hordes of Scythians, Mannai, and Kimmerians in Armenia, were all massing behind the Jûdi Dagh "like vultures awaiting the last moments of their victim," in the words of the same scholar. Probably in the following year, 625 B.C., a native ruler, Nabû-pal-usur or Nabopolassar (*c.* 625-604 B.C.), succeeded in establishing himself on the throne of Babylon, whence the successors of Ashur-bâni-pal were too weak to oust him. The account hitherto accepted by historians has been that Kyaxares succeeded in uniting the Medes and the Umman-manda under his single leadership, and, seizing the opportunity afforded by the advance of the Egyptians to the Euphrates in 608 B.C., formed an alliance with Nabopolassar against the common enemy; two years later, after a long and terrible siege, they took Nineveh by storm, when the last Assyrian monarch perished with his family, his courtiers, and his slaves in the conflagration of his palace. But the evidence for this story was not entirely satisfactory, since the native Babylonian chronicle, as known till recently, stopped abruptly some time before the fall of Nineveh, and historians were compelled to rely on the vague and inexact Greek accounts, notably on those of Herodotus and of Diodorus Siculus; consequently, as Professor S. R. Driver wrote (*The Minor Prophets*, vol. ii., p. 9): "The precise course of events which terminated ultimately in the destruction of Nineveh is not perfectly clear"; and, indeed, a later account contained in an inscription of Nabû-nâ'id, or Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon (559-539 B.C.), seems to show that the Assyrian king Sin-shar-ishkun, about 609 B.C., invaded Babylonia for the purpose of recovering his supremacy over it, and that Nabopolassar then called in the

Umman-manda to his assistance, who thereupon "above and below, right and left, overwhelmed the land like a deluge."

But a flood of new light has been shed on the closing years of the Assyrian Empire by a remarkable discovery which has recently been made. Mr. Gadd, an assistant in the Oriental Department of the British Museum, while working upon the cuneiform tablets contained there, came upon a document, numbered B.M. 21,901, which contained a chronicle of the tenth to the seventeenth years of Nabopolassar—*i.e.*, 619-609 B.C.—and which he published under the title of *The Fall of Nineveh*. This tablet is of baked clay, of a dark brown colour, roughly 5½ inches long by nearly 3 inches in breadth; it is complete in length, but otherwise it has been unfortunately somewhat damaged. When found, it was in four separate pieces, which have been satisfactorily joined without leaving any gaps, except to a small extent in the middle of the reverse; four small fragments also are missing at various points round the edges. But it has suffered more serious injury in the flaking away of the surface in several places, where the reading is therefore almost entirely obliterated. For the rest, the text is well preserved and easy to decipher. It contains thirty-seven lines on the obverse and thirty-nine on the reverse and upper edge, and another on the left edge, "written," says Mr. Gadd, "in a small, but very neat and clear, New Babylonian cuneiform, which probably, although the tablet is not dated, belongs, like other chronicles, to the Achæmenid period." Its style and language show a close affinity to that of the Babylonian chronicle already mentioned, of which it doubtless was a continuation. Fortunately the absence of religious events has allowed the compiler space for an unusually full historical account of what happened during these crucial years, nor is the value of the inscription as an almost contemporary and in any case by far the earliest extant record of the period much impaired by the Babylonian bias of the writer, although he seems to follow the custom of all Eastern historians of exaggerating the successes of his own side and of depreciating, if not actually omitting, those of the enemy.

There is now reason for believing that Nabopolassar's revolt began between 620 and 617 B.C., but the chronicle, as preserved, begins only with the year 616 B.C., which itself would have been regarded as an impossibly early date for the rising before the discovery of this tablet, in the following words:

"In the 10th year (*sc.* of Nabopolassar—*i.e.*, 616 B.C.) in the month Ayâr (*i.e.*, the 2nd month) Nabopolassar mustered the army of Akkad (*sc.* Babylonia) and marched along the Euphrates. The men of Sukhu and Khindanu fought not against him [but] laid their tribute before him" (Obv., ll. 1-2).

These people were two Aramæan tribes lying along both banks of the Euphrates, roughly between the modern Hît and 'Ânah; both had been incorporated in the Assyrian Empire, and the Assyrian king was not slow to take in hand their reconquest. The chronicle goes on to tell how the Babylonians heard the news:

"In the month of Âb (*i.e.*, the 5th month) it was reported that the host of Assyria was in Qablinu" (Obv., l. 3),

a town whose exact location is uncertain, although it can be inferred from this passage that it lay above Khindânu; Mr. Gadd suggests that it lay in the neighbourhood of the modern Dêr-uz-Zûr. Then—

"Nabopolassar went up against them; in the month of Âb, on the 12th day, he engaged the army of Assyria in battle, and the army of Assyria was put to flight before him and a great discomfiture of the Assyrians was made, and they (*i.e.*, the Babylonians) took great spoil of them. The Mannai who had come to their aid and the nobles of Assyria were captured (and) on that day Qablinu was captured" (Obv., ll. 3-6).

The Mannai were a sturdy race, who lived to the south of Lake Urumiyah, and whom Ashur-bâni-pal had brought under the Assyrian yoke. Meanwhile Nabopolassar, having occupied Qablinu, sent out plundering raids in the region of Balikhu, an important stronghold in the Assyrian province of Kharrân; these parties failed or, more probably, did not intend to attack Kharrân itself, and on their return Nabopolassar, in Elûl (*i.e.*, the sixth month), returned to Babylon, completing the despoilment of Khindânu on his way.

In the following month the Egyptians, although about 651 B.C. their king Psammatik, the Greek Psammetichus (663-610 B.C.) of the twenty-fifth or Ethiopian dynasty, had thrown off the Assyrian yoke, now appear under the same king as allies of their former masters and join in the pursuit of the Babylonians:

"In the month of Tishrîtu (*i.e.*, the 7th month) the army of Egypt and the army of Assyria went in pursuit of the king of Akkad as far as Qablinu [but] did not overtake the king of Akkad" (Obv., ll. 10-11),

or, in other words, Nabopolassar had rather retreated before the combined forces of Assyria and Egypt than returned to Babylon as a conqueror. But he seems there to have been able to recruit his forces, for the following lines record that—

"He (*i.e.*, Nabopolassar) hastened in pursuit of them. In the month of Adâr (*i.e.*, the 12th month) the army of Assyria and the army of Akkad joined battle at Madanu, which lies in the district of Arapḫu" (Obv., ll. 11, 12).

Here, as Mr. Gadd points out, it is strange that Nabopolassar, although "he hastened in pursuit of them," failed to find the enemy! For the chronicler himself hastens on to give an account of a successful battle which did not take place until five months later. Probably the Egyptians advanced ever more slowly as they left their base in Syria continually further behind, and exposed their lines of communication more and more to the danger of a Scythian attack. The battle at Madana, somewhere to the south of the River Diyâlâ, resulted in the defeat of the Assyrians:

"The army of Assyria was put to flight before the army of Akkad, and was greatly discomfited and was driven into the river Zâb; their asses and horses were captured, and great spoil was taken of them" (Obv., ll. 12-14).

The text is here slightly damaged, but Nabopolassar seems after this victory to have returned to Babylon with the spoils of war.

The date is missing in the next line, owing to a gap in the tablet, but it is clear that it was the eleventh year of Nabopolassar—*i.e.*, 615 B.C.; the year was occupied with a fruitless attack by the Babylonians on the city of Ashshur, the retreat of the Babylonians to Takrît, and an equally futile siege of that place by the Assyrians. The text runs:

"[In the 11th year the king] of Akkad mustered his army and marched along the Tigris, and in the month of Ayâr encamped over against Ashshur. [On the . . . day] of the month Sîwân (*i.e.*, the 3rd month) he attacked the city, but captured not the city. The king of Assyria mustered his army, and the king of Akkad was driven back from Ashshur, and the Assyrians went in pursuit of him along the Tigris as far as Takrîtain. The king of Akkad took his army up into the citadel of Takrîtain, [and the king of] Assyria and his army encamped over against the king of Akkad who was shut up in Takrîtain. Ten days he attacked them, but captured not the city, [and] the army of the king of Assyria which was shut up in the citadel discomfited them greatly, [and] the king of Assyria and [his] army fled and returned to his country" (Obv., ll. 16-22).

The year closed with a raid by the Medes on the Assyrian province of Arapkhu, which was probably the true reason why the Assyrians abandoned the siege of Takrît; for next year the approach of the Medes became more threatening as they advanced upon Nineveh itself. The text has here suffered much damage; but it seems clear that they captured Tarbis, a city lying a few miles to the north-west of Nineveh, and laid siege to Ashshur, which they took and destroyed, treating the chief men of the place with the greatest cruelty. The king of Babylonia was careful to arrive late, seeing that the issue was

uncertain, as did the Spartans on a famous occasion. The chronicler confesses this when he says:

"The king of Akkad and his army, who had come to the aid of the Medes, were late for the battle" (Obv., l. 29),

but over the ruins of the city he and Kyaxares met and concluded an alliance, after which each returned home for the winter.

The following year (613 B.C.) the Babylonians spent in reducing to submission the Khindânu, who had rebelled, instigated in all probability by the intrigues of the Assyrians. They were successful also against Rakhilu, an island-town in the middle of the Euphrates, but they appear to have failed in the attempt upon Anatu, the modern 'Ânah, which received some measure of support from the Assyrians. Mr. Gadd, relying on the account of Diodorus Siculus, conjectures that the freedom of the Assyrians to operate away from home was due to the approach of the Scythians, who may have diverted the attention of the Medes from Assyria, although in the next year's campaign they appear fighting side by side.

It is indeed unfortunate that the opening lines of the reverse are the worst preserved on the whole tablet, for in them was recounted the actual destruction of Nineveh. The first two lines record the junction of the Babylonians and the Scythians:

"[In the 14th year] the king of Akkad mustered his army [and] the men of the king of the Umman-Manda [came] to meet the king of Akkad; . . . they met together" (Rev., ll. 38-39).

The importance of these lines lies in the mention of the king of Akkad, since it has usually been inferred from the silence of ancient historians that the Babylonians had no share in the sack of Nineveh. From the subsequent account, however, it is clear that the Medes under Kyaxares were also present; probably the correct inference is that drawn by Mr. Gadd, that they played the chief part while the *rôle* of the Babylonians was less important, nor does Nabopolassar himself, when mentioning elsewhere how he threw off the Assyrian yoke, speak in the language of one who had been in any way a prominent actor in so epoch-making an event. The chronicle then continues its narrative in the following words:

"They marched along the Tigris . . . against Nineveh" (Rev., l. 40),

where, though the words "against Nineveh" are only fragmentarily preserved, the reading is hardly open to doubt. And then:

"From the month of Sîwân to the month of Âb [they fought] three battles; they made a powerful attack on the city [and] in the month of Âb [they captured the city], and there was wrought a great [discomfiture of the people and] of the nobles" (Rev., ll. 41-43),

or, as the prophet Nahum (ii. 5) called them, "the worthies." Again, the restoration is highly probable.

The next line told the fate of Sin-shar-ishkun, the king of Assyria, but what that was can only be guessed, as nothing but his name and rank are preserved. His fate is not, as Mr. Gadd strangely asserts, "expressly indicated"; it is, however, probable that he is to be identified with the king whom the Greek historian Abydenus, according to Eusebius, called "Sarakos," and who "burnt himself and his royal palace." Another Greek tradition, preserved by Nicolaus Damascenus and Athenæus, was to the effect that he was slain by the hand of Kyaxares, who had bribed one of his eunuchs to procure him access to the king. The balance of probability is, perhaps, slightly against the first version, on account of its close resemblance to the fate of Shamash-shum-ukîn, whom (in the words of Ashur-bâni-pal) the gods "Ashur, Sin, Shamash, Bêl, Nabû, Ishtar of Nineveh, the Queen of Kidmuri, Ishtar of Arbela, the Queen of Kidmuri, Ninurta, Nergal, and Nusku, who marched before me and annihilated my foes, cast into a burning fire and destroyed his life"—*viz.*, who committed suicide in the burning of his palace. The tablet then tells how—

"they plundered the city of plunder beyond counting in quantity [and turned] the city into an heap and a ruin" (Rev., l. 45),

so that, in the words of the same prophet (Nah. ii. 5), "the palace is dissolved," and the command (*ibid.*, i. 9): "Take ye the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold" is fulfilled. The sack of the city being complete, on the twentieth day of Elûl the Medes and the Babylonians divided the spoil at Nisîbîn and then returned to their respective countries.

The next two lines give the most sensational information; for, in spite of the damage which the text has at this point suffered, the accession of a new and hitherto unknown king and the removal of the throne to the city of Kharrân is clear from the following words:

"In the month of . . . (?) [Ashur-uballit succeeded] to the sovereignty of Assyria at Kharrân [and] sat upon the throne" (Rev., ll. 49-50).

The restoration of the king's name is rendered certain by l. 60. The city of Kharrân, on the road from Nineveh to northern Syria, had long been the second capital of the empire, and was the residence of the *turtânu* or commander-in-chief of the army, and therefore a suitable place of refuge. Mr. Gadd

goes so far as to conjecture that Ashur-uballit may himself have been the *turtânu*, but there is no evidence for this; he may equally well have been a scion of the royal house who had escaped from the doomed city. It is probably, it should be remarked, the flight to the fortress of Kharrân to which the words of Nahum (iii. 11), "Thou also shalt seek a stronghold because of the enemy," are to be referred; for so far they have received no satisfactory explanation. Of the remaining events of 612 B.C. nothing can be made out on the tablet.

The year 611 B.C. was occupied only with minor operations on the part of the Babylonians. They subdued two tribes on the Euphrates, and in the month of Arakhsamna (*i.e.*, the eighth month) they took the town of Rugguliti, with a view to opening up the way to Kharrân, which they were planning to attack. Similarly, in the spring and summer of 610 B.C., they were able to effect little beyond some desultory raiding on the upper reaches of the Euphrates, though the chronicler says:

"In the 16th year (*i.e.*, 610 B.C.) in the month of Ayâr the King of Akkad mustered his army [and] marched into Assyria; from [the month of Ayâr (?)] until the month of Arakhsamna (*i.e.*, the 8th month) they marched triumphantly through Assyria" (Rev., ll. 58-59).

But the situation was materially changed in the autumn, when the Scythians joined the Babylonians. In the words of the chronicler:

"In the month of Arakhsamna the Umman-manda . . . came to the aid of the king of Akkad, and they joined forces and marched against Kharrân in pursuit of Ashur-[uballit], who sat upon the throne in Assyria; and the fear of the enemy fell upon Ashur-uballit and the army . . . and they abandoned the city and crossed [the river]" (Rev., ll. 59-62).

Unluckily, the name of the river is missing; but the fugitives doubtless fled towards Syria, whence their Egyptian allies were operating. Then Kharrân was captured and sacked:

"The king of Akkad reached Kharrân and . . . captured the city and plundered the city of spoil in quantity beyond counting. In the month of Adár the king of Akkad left [a garrison (?)]; and he returned unto his country, and the Umman-manda, who had come to the help of the king of Akkad, [returned to their country]" (Rev., ll. 63-65).

Again, the Babylonian scribe makes it appear that his fellow-countrymen played the chief part in the capture of Kharrân; but a later king, Nabonidus, states that "the heart [of the god Sin] was enraged against that temple and that city; he caused the Umman-manda to attack it, he destroyed the temple and cast it down in ruins." If Nabonidus omitted all mention of the part played in that event by his predecessor Nabopolassar and ascribed it entirely to the Umman-manda,

it could hardly have been a prominent part; and, although the chronicle recorded that Nabopolassar plundered "the city of spoil in quantity beyond counting," his pious successor Nabonidus, in another inscription, exculpated him from the charge of sacrilege with the words: "He laid not his hands on the offerings dedicated to any of the gods." The chronicle then places the fall of Kharrân in 610 B.C., and this date is confirmed by another inscription of Nabonidus, who states in it that "in the beginning of my lasting sovereignty they (*i.e.*, the gods Marduk and Shamash) caused me to behold a dream," in which they commanded him to take in hand the restoration of the temple Khulkhul in Kharrân, "which had lain in ruins fifty-four years through the destruction wrought by the Umman-manda who threw down the sanctuary." Now Nabonidus came to the throne in 555 B.C., between which and 610 B.C. are fifty-four years, after allowing for the fraction of 610 B.C. which is not included; for the Babylonians only took account of whole years in their calculations. This necessitates a correction in Professor Driver's commentary on the *Minor Prophets* (vol. ii., p. 11); he there assumes (for certain reasons which need not here be mentioned) that the fifty-four years given here are to be calculated from the third year of Nabonidus —*i.e.*, 553-552 B.C.—and, confusing the fall of Kharrân with the destruction of Nineveh, places the latter event "in or about the year 607 B.C." The newly discovered chronicle has settled these points once and for all.

The last year with which the chronicle deals is 609 B.C. without any doubt, although the year itself is omitted. From the first line, of which the latter half is missing, it is evident that operations began in Tammuz (*i.e.*, the fourth month), when the Egyptians joined forces with the Assyrians under Ashur-uballit, and a combined attack was made on Kharrân with a view to its recovery. It runs:

> "In the month of Tammuz Ashur-uballit, the king of Assyria [joined forces with] a great army of Egyptians [and] crossed the river and marched against Kharrân to conquer [it]" (Rev., ll. 66-67).

On this occasion the Assyrians captured some of the garrison, and put them to the sword. Thereupon—

> "He (*i.e.*, Ashur-uballit) encamped against Kharrân and made attacks upon the city until the month of Elûl . . . [but] he captured it not" (Rev., ll. 68-69).

Nabopolassar then came to the relief of the beleaguered garrison, burning and destroying the cities of Assyria on his way. The rest of the tablet is too mutilated for the exact course of events to be traced, but the Babylonians apparently despatched

into Armenia a force which returned safely after taking some prisoners from those parts. The tablet then concludes its story with the words:

"The king of Akkad returned to his country" (Rev., l. 75).

Thus historians are still left in the dark as to the precise fate of Kharrân and the ultimate end of the Assyrian Empire. But the catch-line, which was always added at the conclusion of every tablet in a continuous series and consisted of the first few words of the following tablet, so as to indicate its place in the series, though somewhat damaged, ran:

"In the [18th] year . . . the king of Akkad mustered his army,"

showing that there was at least one more tablet in the series. It is therefore much to be hoped that the rest of the chronicle may yet come to light and be published. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that this document, incomplete though it at present is, not only fixes the date of the fall of Nineveh and gives some account of subsequent events, but also necessitates a slight adjustment of the dates hitherto accepted for the prophecies of Nahum. Professor Driver (*op. cit.*, p. 13) in 1906 wrote: "For the date of Nahum's prophecy we have, as a *terminus a quo*, the capture of Thebes (alluded to in iii. 8-10) in 663, and as a *terminus ad quem* the destruction of Nineveh by the Umman-manda in 607. These somewhat wide limits may, however, no doubt, be reduced." His conjecture is now confirmed and the limits may accordingly be reduced. For the *terminus a quo* the year 663 B.C. is still valid; but the *terminus ad quem* must be pushed back to 612 B.C., the new date for the fall of Nineveh. Nor is this date invalidated by the allusion to the ensuing flight to Kharrân, if it is correct so to interpret the prophet's words (iii. 11): "Thou also shalt seek a stronghold because of the enemy," to which reference has already been made, since that event also took place in the same year.

Briefly, then, the new information amounts to this: the final revolt of the Babylonians broke out at least as early as 616 B.C., and Nineveh fell, not in 607 or 606 B.C., as was hitherto supposed, but in 612 B.C., so that the three years' siege, as recorded in a tradition preserved by Diodorus Siculus, must be dated from the attack of the Medes on the city in 614 B.C. until its destruction in 612 B.C., although there was no continuous "siege" in the strict sense of the word until the month of Siwân, 612 B.C.; the king Sin-shar-ishkun presumably perished in the sack of his capital, but a remnant escaped to Kharrân, where they set one Ashur-uballit on the throne and held out for a couple of years; driven out of that place in Arakhsamna, 610 B.C.,

they withdrew into Syria, and in the following year made an unsuccessful attempt to regain possession of Kharrân. Here the story for the present ends, so that the details of the fate of Kharrân and of the gallant remnant under Ashur-uballit are still unknown.

The recovery, therefore, and decipherment of this tablet has gone far towards solving one of the greatest riddles in ancient history and has illuminated in a remarkable manner a period until now buried in the obscurity of accounts, for the most part, of much later date than the events which they record, and consequently inaccurate and often conflicting, and historians owe Mr. Gadd a deep debt of gratitude for his important and interesting discovery and for his admirable edition of the text.

G. R. Driver.

ST. PAUL'S APOSTOLIC COMMISSION

II.—The Second Journey.

After their return from Jerusalem accompanied by St. Mark, the next incident is their dismissal from Antioch. In the course of some religious service, while they were fasting, the Holy Spirit said, probably by the mouth of one or more of the prophets, "Set me apart Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them." Then with fasting and prayers, and the laying-on of hands they were dismissed, and being (thus) sent forth by the Holy Spirit went down to Seleucia, and thence sailed to Cyprus. We notice first that Barnabas and Saul were already prophets and teachers, co-equal in spiritual qualifications with those that laid hands on them. This at once differentiates this ceremony from that of confirmation or ordination. Secondly, there is no mention of their receiving any spiritual endowment or ecclesiastical office by this imposition; they are not said, for instance, to receive the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, the ceremony is described as a commending to the grace of God (Acts xiv. 26). Fourthly, all the prophets and teachers were Jews; Symeon is called by his Jewish and not by his Gentile name, Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene is probably the "kinsman" whom St. Paul mentions in Rom. xvi. 21; and lastly, those who sent them forth are not said to have "apostled them," but only to have let them go (ἀπέλυσαν). The work of the Holy Spirit was to speak, probably through the prophets, and it was with this prophetic utterance upon them that they went forth. This laying on of hands was, therefore, probably not an ordination, but a parting benediction.

In whatever manner it happened, whether by accident or design, or whether it was indicated in the prophecy, Barnabas and Paul no doubt thought that their taking ship to Cyprus was in obedience to the Divine will. With this Divine guidance on a journey we may compare Acts xvi. 6, 7. When we put together the fact that they left Antioch in obedience to a prophetic utterance calling them to take up a work to which they knew they had already received a commission, and that they regarded Cyprus as providentially indicated to them, I think it is probable that Cyprus had been included in their mission at the start, but had hitherto been neglected. Moreover, they do not appear to have spoken to Gentiles (*ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, xiii. 5) until they had traversed the whole island and arrived at Paphos; that is, St. Paul's peculiar work of preaching to heathen populations had not yet begun.

At Paphos, in connection with the Gentile governor Sergius Paulus, St. Paul begins to take the lead. Hitherto it has been "Barnabas and Saul," now we find the Roman name Paul substituted for the Hebrew Saul, which suggests that the Hebrew name which had sufficed hitherto was no longer an adequate designation, and on leaving Paphos the company are called "those with Paul." This is probably significant, and implies that from this time St. Paul resolved that when the Gentiles showed keenness (*προσκαλεσάμενος, ἐπεζήτησεν*, xiii. 7) they were not to be excluded, and the work of St. Barnabas became in consequence subordinate. From Paphos they sailed to Perga. Strabo describes Perga as situated on the River Cestrus, which is navigable up to that point. This probably means that there was a port town on the river ranking not as a separate city, but as part of Perga,* from which it was but a little way distant; supposing a ship to be sailing up the Cestrus to Perga, it would not call at Attaleia, which was some miles west of the mouth of the river. But though they went to Perga, the apostolic company did no preaching there, and probably Ramsay is right in inferring that St. Paul's health made it imperative that he should go at once to the higher ground of Pisidian Antioch.†

At Perga St. Mark left them, and went to Jerusalem. This defection is probably due to a much deeper cause than that of personal cowardice or shrinking from hardship. St. Mark had already abandoned his home in Jerusalem and had done good service in Antioch and Cyprus (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 11), and if this were all he would naturally have returned to Antioch in Syria, from which he had set out. But instead of this, he went to Jerusalem, though in all probability there would have been

* See Ramsay's article on Perga in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

† Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 9?.

many coasting vessels which would have taken him to Antioch had he so desired. At Pisidian Antioch St. Paul began his special work of evangelizing the heathen. The importance of this change is indicated by the length of the report of St. Paul's speech, by its general tone—clearly akin to that of St. Stephen—and possibly by the deliberate choice of certain words and phrases from among the many that St. Paul might have used. Thus the variation ἐξαπεστάλη, in xiii. 26, where the LXX has the uncompounded verb, may have a secondary reference to St. Paul's mission, while v. 47 seems to designate its universal range. There is no doubt that in later times St. Paul regarded his apostolate to the heathen (Gal. ii. 7) as his special "work," and from this work, *the* work, St. Mark drew back (Acts xv. 38). The experience at Paphos had probably decided St. Paul that the time had arrived for making this new departure, and if we agree with Ramsay that St. Paul had wished to begin preaching at Perga, but that reasons of health had compelled him to go to Antioch without delay, then he commenced this work at the earliest possible moment. St. Paul's first discourse was directed to the Jews and those on the fringe of Judaism (οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεὸν, xiii. 16), and this continued to be his regular practice even after his apostolate to the Gentiles had been officially recognized (Acts xviii. 5, 6; xxviii. 28). His language in his epistle to the Romans (i. 16; ii. 9, 10; iii. 29, 30; xv. 8-12), with the quotations from Isaiah in the last passage, are sufficient evidence of the principle on which he worked. But on the following Sabbath the whole city was gathered together (xiii. 14), and in consequence of the envy of the Jews, a definite start was made in beginning a Gentile mission.

But preaching the gospel to the heathen of Pisidia and Galatia was outside the commission which he had received from the apostles at Jerusalem; accordingly, St. Mark returned to Jerusalem from Attaleia for fresh instructions. St. Paul's commission to the heathen rested on a private vision, and had not yet received the authorization of the Church, and St. Mark, a Jew of Jerusalem, refused to countenance it. It is clear that St. Paul felt that there was between them a difference on a great point of principle, and it seems probable that St. Barnabas himself was uneasy and accompanied St. Paul out of personal regard, and in order to be near him in case of another attack of illness.

Leaving Pisidian Antioch, Paul and Barnabas went to Iconium, where they had a Divine testimony to the new policy, for the disciples, including Gentile converts, were filled with the Holy Spirit. From Iconium they went to Lystra and Derbe preaching the word, and it is in the course of this journey that

they are first called "apostles," as though now acting for the first time as plenipotentiaries with full independence (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1). On their return they ordained presbyters in every city by the laying on of hands, a rite which had been employed from very early days by the Apostles at Jerusalem, and by Ananias towards St. Paul himself for the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. They returned by the same route to Antioch, and then accomplished their original intention of evangelizing Perga; but they spent no time in Attaleia, either because they found a ship about to sail immediately, or possibly because there was already an organized Christian community there, and St. Paul held that it was not within the scope of his mission to build on another's foundation (Rom. xv. 20), or for reasons of health, as on the first journey. On their return to Antioch in Syria they declared how God had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles, thus showing that preaching to the Gentiles had not been before attempted, and appealed to the numerous signs wrought by them as evidence of the validity of the Pauline gospel of freedom.

Affairs at Antioch.

The history of the course of events from the arrival of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch to the Council at Jerusalem and St. Paul's rebuke to St. Peter is confessedly obscure. The most that can be done is to frame a hypothesis which will co-ordinate the few facts given to us. To avoid prolixity this hypothetical reconstruction is given in the following paragraphs, as if it were the only one possible, but this dogmatic form should not mislead any reader who bears this caution in mind.

Confident in the leading of the Spirit, as shown by the success of the labours in Asia Minor, St. Paul began to baptize converts, not of course without preparation, but without making enquiry as to whether they had been circumcised, and to admit them to all the privileges of Christianity. At first the Gentile converts were few in number as compared with the large Jewish element, due in great measure to the previous work of himself and Barnabas; and Christians, whether of Jewish or Gentile antecedents, mingled freely and formed a single congregation or Church. Somewhat later St. Peter arrived from Jerusalem, accompanied apparently by St. Mark, whom we left at Jerusalem, and next find at Antioch with no notice of his arrival. St. Peter does not seem to have been fluent in Greek, and was probably unfamiliar with the Septuagint, so in a Greek-speaking community he would need an interpreter. But if this is so, may we not further conjecture that St. Peter was sent from Jerusalem partly in consequence of St. Mark's

report, as well as owing to news of St. Paul's actions at Antioch? At first all went well, and St. Peter ministered in the united congregation without raising any question. Certainly, after his experience in the matter of Cornelius, he would not insist on the Gentiles undergoing circumcision as a condition of being recognized as Christians, and even if he himself had regarded this instance as unique, the comment on his action made by the apostles and brethren in Jerusalem admitted the general principle (Acts xi. 18). Nevertheless, certain Jewish Christians came from Jerusalem pretending the authority of the Church there (Gal. ii. 12; Acts xv. 1), who demanded that the Gentile converts should be circumcised as a condition of their recognition as Christians. Against this St. Paul and St. Barnabas protested with vehemence, and St. Peter also must have been on their side.

But the increasing numbers of Gentile converts raised a new question on which no authoritative decision had yet been given. Granted that it was not necessary for a Gentile to be circumcised in order to be made a Christian, on what footing were Gentile Christians to stand as regards the Jewish converts? Were both to continue to form a single Church, or was it not better that there should be separate congregations of Jewish and Gentile extraction? It must be remembered that the unconverted Jew thought himself polluted by contact with his Gentile neighbours, and though such contact could not be altogether avoided, yet he made a special point of ceremonially cleansing himself before sitting down to meat (Mark vii. 4), and would on no account eat with a Gentile (Acts xi. 3). Would it not be more charitable to spare their natural prejudices until lapse of time should help to remove them? And then there were the unconverted Jews to be considered. Would it not make conversion from among them far more difficult if these deep-seated prejudices were to be totally disregarded? And would it not also serve to embitter opposition? St. Paul and St. Barnabas themselves observed Jewish customs, and such had been the usage of the Church until this recent development. Could not the Gentiles be recognized as Christians but have separate Eucharists, unless, indeed, the Gentiles consented to submit to circumcision, not as a condition of being recognized as fellow-Christians, but in order to preserve unity in the Church? If circumcision was waived as a matter of principle, could it not be conceded by the Gentiles as a matter of charity? Sooner or later this question was bound to be raised, but it would not occur in churches where St. Paul had exclusive authority or where the Gentile element was so small that the few instances that arose would be treated as exceptional. In Asia Minor

St. Paul's ruling would be unquestioned, at any rate, until some other authority appeared on the scene. But no sooner was it suggested that the Church at Jerusalem might hold a different view from his than dissension was almost sure to break out. It was an integral part of the Gospel of St. Paul that the "wall of partition" (a metaphor taken from the wall in the temple which divided the court of the Gentiles from the portion of the precincts reserved for Jews only) had been entirely taken away in Christ, and though in order to disarm prejudice he himself lived as did the Jews (1 Cor. ix. 20), yet he would have nothing to do with anything that suggested the inferiority of Gentile converts. Apparently St. Peter was for bringing moral pressure to bear on the Gentiles to constrain them to conformity, and St. Barnabas was for a time carried away by what might be plausibly urged as a measure of charity, but was on the part of those who came from James simply a disguise for their original argument that circumcision was a necessity of salvation, and intended to achieve the same result (Gal. ii. 13). When leaders of such eminence disagreed, the natural course was to refer the matter to the central body at Jerusalem for settlement, and any hesitation was swept away by a revelation given to one of the local prophets (Gal. ii. 2). Accordingly, with the prayers and goodwill of the Church (Acts xv. 3), St. Paul went up to Jerusalem, accompanied by St. Barnabas, whom he had won back. But St. Paul also insisted upon taking with him an uncircumcised convert, Titus (Gal. ii. 3). St. Peter, therefore, as the matter was now *sub judice*, travelled separately.

The Council at Jerusalem.

On his arrival St. Paul laid his gospel of Gentile freedom before the leaders of the Church privately (Gal. ii. 2). They accepted his principle, but advised the circumcision of Titus as a matter of concession, urging the opposition of those without (*cf.* Acts xxi. 29).* To this St. Paul would by no means assent. Such a concession seemed to him to give away his whole case. In this state of strain the Council met. The first point was to make it clear that the Church still maintained the position it had taken up in the case of Cornelius. Here St. Peter and St. Paul were on the same side, and the men from Judæa had gone beyond their mandate, and acted on their own initiative with no instructions from St. James or any other.

But the question of circumcision being thus decided in favour of the Gentiles, they were required, for the sake of unity, to make certain minor concessions to Jewish prejudices (Acts xv. 29).

* See Murray, *Fragment of Spiritual Autobiography*, p. 16.

In view of the marvellous successes accorded to him (Acts xv. 12; Gal. ii. 8), the authorities could not refuse to recognize the reality of St. Paul's apostolate to the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 7, 9; Eph. iii. 8; Acts xxvi. 17, 18; xxii. 21; xiii. 47), a decision which justified his action in exceeding the commission they had formerly given him. They adopted towards it the attitude taken by St. Peter in reporting to the Church at Jerusalem the conversion of Cornelius, "Who was I that I could withstand God?" (Acts xi 17.) It neither rested on their authority at the beginning, nor did it need it now. Accordingly, the synodical letter was directed to the heathen to whom they had given Barnabas and Saul their original commission, who dwelt in the region of (*κατὰ*) Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. As regards themselves, they decided to evangelize the Jews (Gal. ii. 9), and any Gentiles that might come in would not be of their seeking. If we are to assign the first epistle of Peter and the epistle of James to their reputed authors, we must read the opening titles in this sense. In any event, we must regard the Church of Jerusalem as keenly alive to the feelings, not only of the converted Jews who formed its membership, but also of the unconverted by whom it was surrounded (*cf.* Acts xxi. 21). One thing they pressed on St. Paul, that he should be mindful of their poor, and that, says St. Paul, with a statesman's insight into the opportunity of smoothing away difficulties, "I at once threw myself into with zeal" (ὃ *καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι*; notice the force of the two aorists when by contrast the imperfect and present infinitive would imply that he was doing so already), a resolution which he subsequently carried into effect in the great collection from the Gentile churches. With the letter communicating their decision, they sent also (*ἀπεστάλκαμεν*, Acts xv. 27) Judas and Silas, men of position (*ἡγούμενοι*) among the brethren (*cf.* Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24, an epistle written either to or from the Church at Jerusalem, where this obviously technical term is repeated).

Judas Barsabbas may well have been the brother of Joseph Barsabbas called Justus, a man who only just escaped being admitted into the apostolic college (Acts i. 23), and, as the Gentile name shows, probably a Greek-speaking Jew. Both he and Silas, like Barnabas and Saul, were prophets, and they were sent as plenipotentiary representatives of the authorities at the mother city. With this recognition of his Gentile apostolate, St. Paul returned to Antioch, and after some time suggested to Barnabas that they should revisit the churches they had founded. Barnabas wished Mark to accompany them, but St. Paul resented his defection from the work, while

Barnabas clearly held that this treachery to the cause, as it appeared to Paul, had at least a technical justification, and even if St. Mark had made a mistake, allowance should be made for his youth and upbringing.

This View supported by Epistles to the Corinthians.

This review might well complete our survey, but that the position taken has a curious support in St. Paul's epistle to the Corinthians, in which Church his apostolic authority was challenged. Over and over again we can gather from these letters of St. Paul not only the questions which his correspondents had put to him, but the kind of things which were being said of him among his correspondents from the answer which he makes. At the beginning of chapter ix. of the first epistle occur four questions in immediate juxtaposition, and therefore presumably intimately linked together—"Am I not free? Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen the Lord? Are not ye my work in the Lord?" These suggest that the statements made were that St. Paul was arrogating to himself an independence which, it was claimed, did not belong to him. He was a mere servant. He had not received the apostolate to the Gentiles to which he pretended. The vision which he spoke of rested on his own mere assertion, and could not be corroborated. His special "work" was a fiction, and did not include any commission towards them. Now the vision of our Lord accorded to St. Paul at his conversion was by this time notorious, and with it was given no commission of any kind. Clearly the Corinthian opposition would have weakened the support of their cause by attempting to deny this vision, and their reference to any authority then conferred would have been futile. The reference, therefore, is to the vision in the temple. And this interpretation is supported by other considerations. "Have we not power to lead about a wife as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" with a reference in the mind of St. Paul to his meeting with James and Peter. "Or I only and Barnabas, have we not the right to forbear working?" St. Paul is claiming for himself an independent position with the right to do "the work" or to forbear working on his own responsibility, but why does he introduce Barnabas, who had no connection whatever with Corinth? If we were considering who would be uppermost in St Paul's thoughts in this connection, we should naturally have expected "Silas" instead of "Barnabas." But we may infer that the Corinthian objection was that neither Paul nor Barnabas had a position of independence. Both had received the same jurisdiction, and

Barnabas had rightly confined himself to it, except when he was led away out of kindness of heart.

Perhaps this is also indicated by the next sentence. "If to others I am not apostle, yet at least I am to you," may be St. Paul's retort to some such statement as "He may be an apostle to others, but at any rate he has no commission as regards us"—that is, the Corinthians of the party of Cephas would allow that he had a limited commission as agent to Syria and Cilicia, but he had no independence of action, and they were outside his jurisdiction or κανων (*cf.* 2 Cor. x. 13, 14).

A somewhat similar complaint occurs in the third chapter of the second epistle: "Need we, as some, letters of authorization to you—or such letters from you?" It was evidently said that if St. Paul claimed the right to act, he ought to exhibit credentials from the apostolic body at Jerusalem, letters such as he doubtless took to Tarsus. No, says St. Paul, so far from these being necessary, the Gentiles among whom I laboured were accepted by those authorities at Jerusalem as credentials bearing the unmistakable signature of Jesus Christ.

Conclusion—Summary.

We may, then, conclude that St. Paul received neither ecclesiastical status nor apostolic commission at his conversion. He saw our Lord risen, and as having seen Him, became qualified for an apostolate to be afterwards conferred. The two detailed narratives of Acts ix. and xxiii. make this negative conclusion clear, and any opinion to the contrary is based upon a condensation which omits intervening incidents, and throws together events which, even in fact, were separate. But he was confirmed and possibly also ordained by Ananias, who had the right of the laying-on of hands which, in all other instances, was restricted to the higher orders of the ministry. His preaching was confined to Jews, whether Aramaic or Greek-speaking, until leaving Cyprus, though heathen hearers might happen to be present, as occurred at Paphos. Towards the close of his first visit to Jerusalem, after his conversion, he had a vision of our Lord in the temple, who there and then entrusted him with an apostolate to the Gentiles. He refers to this in the beginning of his epistle to the Galatians as being not by men, nor through man, but through Jesus Christ. But he also received a limited "apostolate" to the Jews of Cilicia, Syria, and Cyprus from St. Peter and St. James, as recorded in chapter ix. This limitation to the Jews is indicated by the fact that the conversion of Cornelius, which may be called the beginning of the opening of the door to the Gentiles, is recorded in the Acts

after the mission of Paul and Barnabas to Tarsus and Antioch. Before he was thus sent forth, St. Paul was almost certainly a presbyter by due ordination, having the power also of ordaining others. The evidence for this last point is cumulative, and cannot here be completely retraversed; but the weight of the argument can well be seen, if we suppose what might have been said had we no direct record of St. Paul's baptism. It would have been urged that the older apostles had never received Christian baptism, and therefore it was not necessary in the case of St. Paul. He would be supposed to refer to the vision at his conversion (and not, as is actually the case, to his baptism), when he says "it pleased God . . . to reveal His Son in me" (Gal. i. 16); and therefore St. Paul would be thought to have reckoned this vision equivalent to baptism by which others were born in Christ or Christ came into them. The practice of the Church, it would have been said, proved nothing in so exceptional an instance. The fact that he conferred baptism on others would be taken as insufficient to show that St. Paul would not have been sent forth to Tarsus without it. St. Paul, it would be urged, could very well himself administer it or direct it to be administered by a member of his staff without feeling it first necessary to have been baptized himself. And, finally, the evidence of his spiritual success showed that baptism might be dispensed with.

The argument is almost exactly similar to that which is used against St. Paul's ordination, but we well know its conclusion is entirely false. The evidence is that ordination by laying-on of hands was already a long-established practice of the early Church; that St. Peter himself ordained; that no delegate from the apostolic college with administrative power was, as far as we know or can see, ever sent out unless he was ordained; that ordination was practised by St. Paul throughout the churches, and probably for years before he entered on the execution of his Gentile apostolic commission in Pisidian Antioch; and that in reality the choice is between holding that the laying-on of hands by Ananias included St. Paul's ordination or that he was ordained by St. Peter or St. James at Jerusalem.

F. J. Badcock.

INVOCATION IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST*

The power of the Divine Name was a central conception of Hebrew religion. Traube, the prince of modern palæographers, has taught us in his *Nomina Sacra* that the Sacred Names were treated by early scribes with a special caution. They were written in abbreviated forms when no other kind of abbreviation was in use, with the intention, it would seem, of half-revealing and half-concealing their exact form. In the manuscripts of the Greek Old Testament the name *God* and the name *Lord* are written with the first and the last letter only. It was not the frequency of their occurrence, but the potency inherent in them, that made it desirable to indicate them by symbols only: it was not to save parchment, but to guard against misuse, that they were cut down to their lowest forms.

This Jewish practice passed over with much else into the Christian Church: the Septuagint handed it on to the New Testament; and there not only the word *God* but *Jesus* and *Christ* were thus abbreviated; *Father, Son* and *Spirit*, when applied to God, and only then, were not written in full: the secret of the Divine Name was kept from those who knew it not already. It was the power inherent in the Name that occasioned this caution; and a parallel to it is found in the anxiety which some early Christian writers display that the sacred elements of the Eucharist should be jealously guarded.

To what extent this conception prevailed in pagan cults before they came in contact with Judaism or Christianity is not very clear: but Origen in a famous chapter of the *Philocalia*† tells us that he had learned from persons skilled in incantations that if the names of a formula were translated into another language they lost their potency; and he applies the same principle to the various titles of God Himself. If you translate the appellation "God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob" into the Greek equivalent "God of the father of the people" and so forth, your adjuration or exorcism will effect nothing; and so again if you render "Sabacth" as "Lord of powers" or "Lord of Hosts" or "Almighty."

* This article contains the substance, revised and amplified, of two sermons preached before the University of Oxford on June 3 and December 9, 1923. I desire to call attention to an important article by Dom Connolly in the *Downside Review* (January, 1923) "On the Meaning of *Epiclesis*." We have been for some time collaborating on the subject, which still calls for fuller investigation.

† Cap. xvii. (from *Contra Celsum*).

This preliminary observation enables us to understand the importance attached to the hallowing of places or of persons by putting the Divine Name upon them. "This house whereupon my Name is called" comes again and again in the book of Jeremiah (vii. 10 *f.*, 14). "Thou, O Lord," cries the same prophet, "art in the midst of us and thy Name hath been called upon us: leave us not" (xiv. 9). On His temple and on His people the hallowing Name has been invoked (ἐπικέκληται).

The Greek word for this naming or invoking means first of all merely to "name" or sometimes to "surname" (ἐπικαλεῖν): presently (especially in the middle voice, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι) it gets the meaning to "appeal by name." It is thus used in adjuration (calling to witness) and imprecation, and so in the general sense of invocation. Hence it is an accompaniment of prayer. "They all prayed, and invoked the gods who had been wronged" (Herodian); and in the LXX "they encountered their enemies with invocations and prayers" (2 Macc. xv. 26). Both pagan and Jewish writers observe the distinction between invocation and prayer.

The Greek verb acquires the further meaning of invitation, as, for example, to invoke the aid of allies. But the noun (ἐπίκλησις) never acquires this extension of meaning until a much later time.

"I invoke thee" is the regular form in calling upon deities by their various names and titles. Here there is a question of the special fitness of the designation. "I invoke thee after the Egyptian manner as *Phnoeai Iabok*, and after the Jewish manner as *Adonai Sabaoth*" occurs in an Egyptian magical papyrus.* And it would be easy to quote invocations of the goddess Isis, "of the many names"; as in a second-century papyrus which is thought to have a first-century origin, and in which we read after a long list of names: "O Lady Isis, greatest of the gods, first of names *Io Sothis:* thou rulest over the mid-air and the immeasurable . . . they behold thee who invoke thee faithfully . . . thou bringest the sun from rising unto setting, and all the gods are glad; at the risings of the stars the people of the country worship thee unceasingly . . . they become joyful when they name thee . . . thou broughtest back alone thy brother (Osiris), piloting him safely and burying him fittingly," and so forth.* This forms an instructive parallel to the great invocation which closes St. Clement's Epistle to the Romans just at the same date, and to the elaborate recitation of divine titles and acts of redemption in the Anaphora or Canon of the Greek Liturgies.

So we approach a topic which the controversies of the day

* *Oxyr. Pap.*, 1380 (vol. xi., pp. 190 *ff.*).

have thrust into prominence—the Epiclesis or Invocation in the Holy Eucharist. We have learned from our introductory survey that Invocation is primarily a matter of the naming of a powerful Name and the recital of appropriate attributes of the deity invoked. The Name has an inherent potency, which is thus brought into play for a particular purpose: it may be for adjuration, or for imprecation upon enemies, or it may be in connection with a special petition. In the Old Testament the Name of God is invoked on persons or on things to hallow them. In the New Testament St. Peter declares: "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." And when the rulers ask, "By what power, or in what name, have ye done this?" he replies, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead . . . for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iii. 6, 10, 12). So Justin Martyr tells us more than once that the current formula was "In the Name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate," and St. Irenæus after him declares that demons are made subject "by the invocation of the Name of Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate" (*Demonstr. c.* 96).

The Invocation of the Name is an essential element of Holy Baptism. Saul of Tarsus is bidden to wash away his sins, "invoking His Name" (Acts xxii. 16). We are ourselves accustomed to apply the word Invocation *par excellence* to the formula with which preachers frequently begin their sermons: "In the Name of . . ." This is the full baptismal formula: Origen calls it "a certain mystical *epiclesis*";* and the writer of the *Apostolic Constitutions* speaks of it as "the *epiclesis* of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."† Other examples, Greek and Latin, might easily be quoted.

It is more to our purpose to note that already in the second century the consecration of the Eucharist was regarded as effected by *Epiclesis* or Invocation of the Divine Name. St. Irenæus tells how the Gnostic Marcus, "pretending to consecrate a mixed cup of wine, and drawing out at length the word of *epiclesis*, makes it appear red; so that it may seem that Charis, who is from the powers above the universe, is dropping her blood into that cup through his *epiclesis*."‡ And in a famous passage, based on Justin Martyr, he says: "The bread derived from the earth, receiving the *epiclesis* (or invocation) of God, is no longer common bread, but Eucharist."§ Origen in like manner speaks of "the bread that is greater than the shew bread, over which has been invoked the Name

* *Comm. in Joan.* iii. 5. † III. xvi. 4. ‡ I. vii. 2. § IV. xxxi. 4

of God and of Christ and of the Holy Spirit."* And the like Invocation of the Holy Trinity is mentioned by St. Ambrose when, speaking of the Holy Spirit, he says: "He who with the Father and the Son is by the priests named in baptism and invoked in the oblations."† In all these passages we feel that what is in question is not a petition for the coming of the Blessed Trinity upon the elements of bread and wine, but a naming of the Sacred Name of God by way of consecration. And the extant Liturgies show us that the only naming of the Holy Trinity in the prayer of consecration was the "By Whom and with Whom" of the doxology with which it closed.

By the middle of the fourth century this conception of the hallowing power of invocation had reached its height. St. Cyril of Jerusalem is our most abundant witness: let us note a few passages.

Catech. iii. 3: As the offerings on heathen altars are in their natural condition just what they are and no more (λιτά), but become polluted things by the naming of the idols (τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῶν εἰδώλων): so contrariwise the water, which is water and nothing more, when it receives the naming of the Holy Spirit and Christ and the Father (πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ χριστοῦ καὶ πατρὸς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν λαβόν), acquires a potency of holiness (δύναμιν ἁγιότητος ἐπικτᾶται).

Ibid. 12: You go down into the water bearing your sins; but the invocation of grace (ἡ τῆς χάριτος ἐπίκλησις), sealing the soul, suffers it not to be overwhelmed by the fearsome dragon. (The dragon was in the water: Jesus at His baptism went down and bound the strong one in the water, *ibid.* 11.)

Cat. Myst. i. 7: In pagan markets meats and loaves are sometimes displayed for sale, polluted by the invocation of the accursed demons (τῇ τῶν παμμιάρων ἐπικλήσει δαιμόνων). They must be reckoned among the pomps of the devil. For even as the bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the invocation of the Holy and Adorable Trinity, were mere bread and wine, but when invocation had taken place (ἐπικλήσεως δὲ γενομένης) the bread becomes Christ's Body and the wine Christ's Blood; so also in like manner such meats of Satan's pomp (or worship, πομπῆς), being in their own nature mere foods (λιτά), become by the invocation of the demons profane.

Ibid. ii. 3: Of the exorcised oil used before baptism. For as the breathings of the saints and the invocation of the Name of God (τὰ ἐμφυσήματα τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἡ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπίκλησις) like a fierce flame scorch and drive away the demons, so also this exorcised oil, by invocation of God and by prayer, receives so great a power, etc.

Ibid. iii. 3: Of the unction after baptism. But beware of supposing that ointment to be mere ointment: for as the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Spirit (μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος) is no longer mere bread, but the Body of Christ; so also this holy ointment is no longer mere, or as one might say common, ointment, but a gift of Christ's grace (Χριστοῦ χάρισμα) and by the advent of the

* On 1 Cor. vii. 5 (*Journ. of Theol. Studies*, ix. 502).
† *De Spiritu Sancto*, iii. 16, 112.

Holy Spirit rendered an effective instrument of His Godhead (*καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσίᾳ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον*).

Ibid. v. 19: Speaking of *τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις*, he says: Holy are the gifts presented, having received the arrival (*ἐπιφοίτησιν*) of the Holy Spirit.

The last two passages—especially the former of them in which the expression "the *epiclesis* of the Holy Spirit" appears for the first time, as it would seem, in Christian literature—prepare us for the well-known words in which St. Cyril describes the consecration of the Holy Eucharist:

Ibid. v. 7: We beseech (*παρακαλοῦμεν*, not *ἐπικαλούμεθα*) the merciful God to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the elements set forth (*ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα*), that He may make (*ἵνα ποιήσῃ*) the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ:* for in very deed whatever the Holy Spirit has touched, this has been sanctified and changed.

These last words indicate a new line of thought, quite distinct from anything that we have found in earlier writers in connection with the Invocation of the Divine Name. We have approached the age of the great controversies regarding the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity: the question of the Holy Spirit's special functions assumes a new importance. St. Cyril's language as to the Invocation of the Holy Spirit for the change of the bread and wine of the Eucharist is to find its parallels in the great Liturgies of the Eastern Church.

Strange to say, this clause of the Consecratory Prayer came in later days to be singled out as "*the* Epiclesis," and as it never had a place in the Roman Canon it became a point of controversy between East and West. One result has been that the general use of *epiclesis* in all hallowing rites has been forgotten, and the word has come to signify exclusively a petition for the sending of the Holy Spirit to effect the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and our own Liturgy has been pronounced defective because we follow the example of the undivided West and have "no *epiclesis*."

It is true that in some Gallican forms such an *epiclesis* is found; and much play has been made with the so-called Mozarabic Liturgy, especially by persons who appear to be unaware of the remarkable character of this Spanish rite, in which every Mass varies in the wording of its prayers, the general framework only being constant.† The recital of the

* *Cf. Liturgy of St. James: ἵνα ἐπιφοίτησαν . . . ποιήσῃ κ.τ.λ*: Swainson, p. 278; Brightman, p. 54 (where *ποιῇ* would seem to be a misprint).

† So the late Dom Férotin, whose researches have thrown a flood of new light on this Liturgy, writes in his Introduction to the *Liber Sacramentorum* of Toledo (1912): "Le cadre reste le même; mais le tableau qu'il renferme, je veux dire le texte des formules, change avec chaque nouveau mystère, avec chaque nouveau saint qu'il s'agit d'honorer."

Institution is here followed by a prayer entitled *Post Pridie*, that is, "After *qui pridie quam pateretur*," etc. This is in general a prayer for the acceptance of the gifts, or for the sanctification of the elements or the worshippers with a view to a profitable communion. I have examined 225 forms of the *Post Pridie* prayer,* and find that in 39 only is sanctification asked for through the Holy Spirit. In 29 it is asked direct from Christ; in one from the Holy Trinity; in six by means of an angel: usually the petition is simply addressed to God. In only six instances is there a request that the Holy Spirit may be sent for the purpose of effecting the change of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ. These sixth and seventh century witnesses are evidence of Eastern influence, and are but the exceptions that prove the rule for the West.

It was, indeed, inevitable that in a prayer for the sanctification of the elements, varying in language in every Mass, the Holy Spirit should not infrequently be mentioned. But it cannot be too often repeated that this is not the Eastern "*Epiclesis*," which is a definite petition for the Holy Spirit's advent to transform the elements. The few prayers in which this kind of petition occurs in the Mozarabic Masses show affinity (sometimes identity) with the few which are found in Gallican Masses: the literary problem which this similarity offers still awaits solution. But it is quite unreasonable to suggest that we are here dealing with an early feature of Western Liturgy which has been suppressed by the Roman Church.

The Consecration Prayer ascribed to St. Hippolytus in the early part of the third century has, after the recital of the Institution, a petition for the sending of the Holy Spirit upon "the oblation of the Holy Church" to bestow unity and to strengthen faith. But this is too early, as the other witnesses are too late, to offer evidence for the formal use of the Church in Rome: it belongs to the period when liturgical forms were dependent on the will of the presiding bishop, the general scheme of the service alone being fixed. There are those amongst us who desire that some such petition as this should be introduced at the same point in our own Liturgy, and who plead that dishonour is done to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity by the refusal to make express mention of His action in our most solemn worship. A like complaint was made the other day, perhaps with more reason, of the omission of His Name from both the Ember Collects. It may be helpful to such persons to be reminded that at the very outset of our Office of Holy Communion we have a Collect in which we pray

* These figures are subject to revision, but may be taken as approximately correct. The authorities are Lesley in Migne, *P.L.*, lxxxv.; Dom Férotin in *Liber Ordinum* and *Liber Sacramentorum*.

in the most impressive terms for "the inspiration" of the Holy Spirit, that we may worthily magnify God's Holy Name.

Before passing to the consideration of some further proposals of change in our Consecration Prayer, it will be desirable somewhat to extend our view. We have noted the significance attached in early days to the invocation of Sacred Names. Such invocation was employed in order to bring into play the potency of the Name or Names, whether in adjuration or in imprecation: and it formed a constant element in praise and prayer. It found at last its highest application in the great Offering of Thanksgiving for the benefits of our Redemption—the Holy Eucharist of the Catholic Church. This is the supreme act of Christian worship.

How shall we worship God? It is an old question, and there is a very old answer to it. "What reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the benefits that he hath done unto me? I will receive the cup of salvation, and call upon the Name of the Lord."* *Quid retribuam Domino? Nomen Domini invocabo.*

The earliest worship of which we read in the Bible is the worship of two brothers. One was a tiller of the ground, the other a keeper of sheep. Each brought the first-fruits of his labour; the one his fruit and corn, the other a lamb. The story is written to tell us the necessary condition of acceptable worship. Abel's offering was accepted, Cain's was not. And the reason is not in the kind of offering, but in the spirit of the offerer. For to Cain it was said: "If thou doest well, shalt not thou be accepted?" But he had evil thoughts in his mind, and envy against his brother.

The giving back to God in thankfulness the first-fruits of what He has given to us is accepted as the expression of worship. Acts may often express more than words: but they must be done out of an honest and true heart. It is not as though God needed anything at our hands—except our love. Our love He needs as a father needs the love of his child. For the sake of this He made man, that last and most wonderful of all His creatures, to the end that man may freely offer to God the love of a thankful heart that glorifies Him that formed it.

On these simple lessons Christian teachers of the second century delighted to insist. I have been using in part their very words. In those days the elaborate sacrifices of the Jewish Temple had but lately ceased to be offered. This had come about through the destruction of the Temple, the only place in which it was lawful to offer them. Such sacrifices as involved the shedding of blood, so these early teachers taught, had received their mystical fulfilment in Christ, the Paschal Lamb,

* Ps. cxvi. 12 *f.*

who was sacrificed for us on the Cross. But thankofferings of the fruits of the earth, of corn and wine in particular, remained in a transfigured form in the offering of the Holy Eucharist. Already, before the first century closed, Clement of Rome could speak of the leaders of the Christian Church as "those who offered the gifts."

Bishop Lightfoot, writing of "the sacrifice of praise" as Clement in his Epistle calls it, says: "Our true relation to God is a constant interchange—God's magnificent gifts realized by us, our reciprocal offerings, however unworthy, presented to and accepted by Him. The eucharistic celebration of the Church is the outward embodiment and expression of this all-pervading lesson. The eucharistic elements, the bread and wine—and, still more comprehensively, the tithes and first-fruits and other offerings in kind, which in the early Church had a definite place amidst the eucharistic offerings—are only a part of the great sacramental system. All things spiritual and material, all things above and below, the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace, fall within its scope. Heaven and earth alike are full of God's glory; and shall they not be full of human thanksgiving also? This idea underlies the earliest liturgical forms; it underlies, or rather it absorbs, Clement's conception. There is no narrow ritual and no cramping dogma here. The conception is wide and comprehensive, as earth and sea and sky are wide and comprehensive. It inspires, explains, justifies, vivifies, the sacramental principle."*

The Thanksgiving—for that is the meaning of the Greek word Eucharist—was the name by which these early Christians knew the sacred rite which our Lord had instituted at His Last Supper. Here was something which they could offer to God in return for His gifts to them—gifts not only of earthly food but of spiritual blessings. That last Passover, they said, was the close of the old dispensation; the Holy Eucharist then instituted was the beginning of the new—it was the New Covenant, sealed by the Blood of Christ. So they spoke of the Eucharist as the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and they regarded its celebration by the universal Church throughout the world as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Malachi: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my Name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto my Name, and a pure offering: for my Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Mal. i. 11).

There was, indeed, more to them in this wonderful service than the thankful offering of material gifts to God. These gifts

* *Clement of Rome*, i. 391.

were received back by them, in virtue of our Lord's own words, as the Body and the Blood of Christ Himself. "This food," says Justin Martyr, writing his Apology to the Roman emperor about the year 153, "is called among us Eucharist . . . for not as common bread or common drink do we receive these things, but . . . we are taught that this food, made Eucharist, is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus who became flesh for us."* And so St. Irenæus a generation later: "The bread that is from the earth, receiving the Invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly."† Such language comes again and again. It remains, however, true that the main stress was laid in the earliest days, not on the benefits which we receive from the Holy Sacrament, but rather on the supreme act of worship by which we offer our Eucharist, or Thanksgiving, to Almighty God.

This essential element is emphasized in all Liturgies, Eastern and Western, and it finds clear expression in our own. "Let us give thanks unto our Lord God." "It is meet and right so to do." "It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God." "But chiefly are we bound to praise Thee," etc., (on Easter Day). And presently we say: "O Lord and Heavenly Father, we Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . and although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service."

Yet plain as the words are, the fact remains that we English folk are more apt to look upon the Holy Eucharist as a means of obtaining something from God than as a means of offering something to God. The causes of this lie in part far back in history: we need not attempt to unravel them now.

But we may properly ask whether this element of the Offering of Thanksgiving, plain as it is when our attention has been drawn to it, is not somewhat obscured by the structure of our Eucharistic Office, and might not advantageously be brought into clearer prominence by such alteration as would effect a change of emphasis without introducing any change of doctrine. The revision of the Communion Service has been discussed by the Houses of Clergy and Laity in the recent sessions of the Church Assembly. All the prognostications of bitter antagonism have been falsified, and the discussions have been marked in both Houses by reverence and reasonableness, and by an unfailing charity.

* Apol. 166. † *Contra. hær.*, IV. xviii. 5.

Some of us are sufficiently satisfied with our existing Office to wish for no change at all, except in the introductory section, where we should welcome the permission to omit on occasion the recital of the Ten Commandments without any substitute for them, and to pass at once from the Collect for Purity to the ninefold *Kyrie* and the Collect for the day.

Others of us would gladly go a step further, and give the desired emphasis on "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" by moving the so-called Prayer of Oblation, which now follows the Lord's Prayer after the Communion, to its more appropriate place as the completion of the Prayer of Consecration. That central prayer now ceases abruptly with the recital of our Lord's words, and, unlike our other prayers, is neither offered in the name of our Lord nor closed with a Doxology. When we recall the stress laid in the early centuries on the Invocation of the Holy Trinity, we cannot but regret that the great words "By Whom and with Whom in the unity of the Holy Ghost" have been thus removed from their old position. The simple transference of this one prayer, with or without prefixing the word "wherefore," would abundantly satisfy our desire for change.

But, yet again, there are others among us who wish to take this opportunity of amending the structure of our Canon, and bringing it into closer conformity with the general usage of the Western Church—not indeed recurring to the complexity of the Latin Canon, but restoring a natural sequence of thought as well as more expressly emphasizing the element of Thanksgiving.

At this point there is a marked cleavage of opinion. Some would find the easiest solution in returning to the Canon of the First Edwardian Book, in spite of the fact that no branch of the Anglican Communion which has adopted this form has been satisfied to use it without alteration. The wording, as well as the position, of the special Invocation which Cranmer introduced in partial imitation of the Greek Liturgies has proved a constant stumbling-block.

But apart from this proposal, no less than three other forms of the Canon were before the House of Clergy for consideration. Those who were responsible for the introduction of the several forms were asked to confer among themselves and see if some one form could not be agreed upon. They reported by presenting two forms which they desired to see authorized as alternatives. Each of these represented some measure of concession amongst the proposers, but they could not agree on a single form as the House had desired. This solution was provisionally adopted. If eventually confirmed, it would mean that

besides the Canon in the Prayer-Book two alternative Canons would be authorized which would inevitably be regarded as distinctive of divergent groups within the Church of England. There are many who feel that if the main body of Churchmen cannot agree on a single alternative form, it would be better for the present to remain as we are.

One of the proposed alternatives I myself would readily welcome, if it be held that the peace of the Church and the restoration of authority and obedience in matters liturgical depend upon its acceptance. But the acceptance of the second alternative form I should greatly deplore. Those who have followed me in what I have said as to the history and interpretation of the act of Invocation, especially with regard to the Invocation of the Holy Trinity in the Eucharist in early times, will regret the introduction of a special Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the sacred elements and upon those who offer them.

If it be pleaded that this is an approximation to the Eastern use, I would urge that we should keep clearly in our minds what that usage essentially is. The Eastern Invocation, commonly called by its Greek name the *Epiclesis*, is a petition addressed to God the Father that He would send the Holy Spirit in order to effect a change in the elements of bread and wine, so as to make them to be the Body and Blood of Christ. Now this is not intended by those who have proposed the form in question. What then? No more than a calling down of the Holy Spirit upon ourselves and upon the gifts we offer, with a view to a profitable Communion.

I ask: Why upon the gifts? You will only introduce a new complication to English minds. They also will ask, Why? And I would further put the question: When first is the Holy Spirit spoken of as consecrating things as distinguished from persons? I doubt if the conception can be found in the Old Testament, as certainly it is not in the New.

And again, why at this point upon ourselves? Is it forgotten that, as I have said above, we have made this request in notable words at the very outset of our Office?

But there is a deeper reason why we should not make so serious a change. I beg you to consider for a moment the fundamental idea of the consecration of the Holy Eucharist in the Western Church. I would state it briefly thus:

The Lord Himself according to His promise comes to be present in the midst of those who are gathered in His Name. He comes to do what He did at that Last Supper, when, before He was parted from His sorrowing disciples, He gave them Himself. It is He Himself who by the mouth of His minister

speaks once again the words: "This is My Body," "This is My Blood." And because He says it, the act is now, as it was then, His and not our act, except in so far as human agency is necessary for speaking the Divine word. It is the act of the present Saviour. This is the doctrine of the English Church. This is the teaching of the Western Church from the time of Justin onwards. The *Logos*, as he would phrase it, identifies Himself with the Bread and Wine.

The Eastern Church, since Cyril of Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century, has consistently regarded this sacred mystery from another point of view. Working out the parallel with the Incarnation upon other lines, it has sought to introduce the action of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, as in the Conception from the Virgin, so also to bring about the change of the elements into the sacred Body and Blood of Christ. However true, however beautiful that leading idea may be, it is profoundly different from the view of the Church in the West.

I urge that the two ideas should be kept distinct in our minds—that we should not do anything by which we might even seem to depart from the teaching of the West which is embodied in our present Liturgy. The matter is one that does not affect our Church alone. The last Lambeth Conference recalled to our minds and hearts the inspiring thought of the mediating position of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*. We have our points of contact with East and West. Nothing will be gained in the view of the East if we insert into our Liturgy what cannot satisfy Eastern theologians as being in their sense a true Epiclesis. On the other hand new and grave difficulties will arise if we have to meet Western theologians with the apparent fact that we are so little satisfied with the Western view of this holy rite (which they admit we have retained in its essence) that we have sanctioned an alternative use which suggests that we are moving away in one important direction from the doctrine and custom of the West which we have inherited from our fathers.

J. Armitage Robinson.

EVANGELICAL CATHOLICISM

One of the publishing events of 1923 was the appearance of Heiler's great book on Catholicism (*Der Katholizismus: seine Idee und seine Erscheinung:* München), which works out in detail the ideas contained in a volume of lectures delivered in Sweden in 1919. The author is a comparatively young man, who passed over from Catholicism to Lutheranism, retaining

the warmest possible affection for the Church of his upbringing. Briefly his purpose is to recommend Evangelical Catholicism, which he considers impossible of realization in the Roman Communion to-day. I want to urge on English Churchmen the close study of this fascinating book. But as many cannot read German it may be helpful to review it with some fulness. In order to keep an independent judgment, I have purposely refrained from reading Dean Inge's article on the book in *The Quarterly Review*. I have no wish to obtrude my own opinions, and so propose to give the minimum of explanation and criticism.

I leave until the end the exceedingly interesting criticisms of the earlier book quoted in the Preface and begin with p. xxiv. Heiler's method is " cyclic "—that is, he goes round the subject and looks at it from different sides before plunging into its heart. He parts company with that modern scientific theology of which one has said: " Theology is the science which does not speak of its subject—God," and includes his own religious experience in his scientific treatment of religion. His motto is to speak the truth in love. But criticism must be free—it is a fact of the utmost importance that free criticism of the hierarchy such as we find in St. Bernard and Dante is no longer allowed. And to be of any value, it must be radical, in the sense of getting down to the roots. He criticizes the Lutheran High Church movement as being too much of an organized programme and not a natural growth. But he agrees with its five main demands—Unity, Episcopacy, Confession, Sacramental Worship, and Mysticism—this is the practical policy needed for Lutheran Germany, now largely pagan. He concludes the Preface by owning his obligations to two English writers whose works are unobtainable in Germany—Baron von Hügel and Evelyn Underhill.

Catholicism, so we read in the Introduction, is the most significant force in the world to-day. Theology fails to describe its manifold life. Rationalism makes nothing of it. Only love can unlock the door. To understand Catholicism is the task of a lifetime and then it is not finished. It is the best introduction to the study of comparative religion, for the religions of antiquity can here be studied in the living present. Christian antiquity can only be understood by him who knows Catholicism to-day. For Germany especially the issues are vital. Protestantism is in a terribly difficult position. It is either petrified in a narrow orthodoxy or withered by rationalism. The labouring masses have deserted it, and the throne on which it leaned has disappeared. Only by knowing Catholicism and asserting over against it the pure Evangelical ideal can the

conquering progress of Romanism be arrested. "War is the father of all things," and strife with Rome is unavoidable. But only one kind of strife is possible for Evangelicals, a noble fight, one in which love for Rome is the dominant motive, at bottom a contest which can love Christ most. Catholicism, be it noted, is for Heiler the Roman Church. The Eastern Church is comparatively unimportant. It is the Church of Dionysius the Areopagite and St. John Damascene, petrified at that stage. "It is a in a manner static and not dynamic Catholicism" like that of the West. "The Church of the East . . . is a holy temple, in which one can quietly pray and worship. The Church of the West is the same for its mystics, but it is much more and intends to be much more—Christ's visible kingdom on earth, which ever extends its boundaries, which conquers and triumphs over all its foes." Anglican Catholicism does not rise over Heiler's horizon.

The book now begins in earnest. It falls into two main parts, the first dealing with the growth of Catholicism as mirrored in its geniuses, the second with the fundamental principles of its system.

I

Jesus founded no Church. Modern research has recovered for us the true lineaments of the Lord, Who, instead of foreseeing all until the end of time as Catholicism asserts and therefore founding an institution, believed in the approaching end of the age. The key to His attitude towards Judaism is found in the recognition that He was conservative, only He concentrated on one element in the whole, the prophetic, and left the rest in the background. "The Church" occurs only in the special matter of Matthew, and there is Aramaic in character not Roman. All this is familiar enough. Heiler merely repeats Schweitzer and does not seem to have studied the problem at first hand. But his verdict on p. 43 is a great improvement on many judgments of German scholars: "Already we find apostolic Christianity beginning to be Catholic, the Catholicizing of Christianity begins immediately after Jesus' death. The feast of Pentecost is at bottom the birth-hour of the Catholic world-Church; not the man Jesus but the Lord Christ and His Spirit founded the universal Church."

The Jerusalem Church had from the first a universalist tendency. It consisted of those who expected the coming of Jesus, into which the Kingdom of the Gospels had been translated. Three tendencies were present from the beginning—dogma, hierarchy, and sacraments. Dogma is seen in Acts iv. 12, which is the germ of later definitions. The apostles

already in chapter xv. have an episcopal character. Baptism into the name of Christ was practised from the first, as was also a sacred meal of eschatological import, in anticipation of the feast in the Kingdom of Heaven.

St. Paul prepares the way for later Catholicism. Spurred by the eschatological motive and convinced that it was his duty to win as many converts as possible in the shortest time, he adapted the gospel for the weak, for babes, anticipating future Catholic custom. Paul invented the anathema and excommunication; he invented also the *Heilsmythus* such as we find in the great Christological passages. (This phrase is used in no derogatory sense but to describe the necessary expression of the meaning of the gospel in terms of realities which transcend history.) But Paul is the father of heretics as well as of Catholics and the later Church has never felt quite at home with him. He is unique in that he is the only great Catholic who lost none of the Evangelical values.

Heiler now gives a brilliant sketch of the course of Church History. The first great struggle was against Marcionism on the one side and Gnostic syncreticism on the other, the two dangers of ceasing to be Catholic by reducing the Gospel to one formula, and the danger of ceasing to be Christian at all. Christianity becoming all things to all men without a Paul to keep the door is Gnosticism. "Gnosticism was produced by the warmth of the greenhouse: the Church ripened slowly" (80). This hardening process was necessary; at this stage the Church could not absorb the elements which later she made part of herself. In this first great fight the Roman Church did most. "Rome played the leading part in the great Church-building process of the second century. Her claim to keep this rôle of leadership for all time possesses a certain historical legitimacy" (84).

At a later date Dionysius the Areopagite is a parable. As the Church unwittingly took him to be apostolic, so she unwittingly took over Neoplatonism and dying paganism. St. Augustine is the greatest genius of all. He embodies all the contradictions of Catholicism by being Catholic, Evangelical and mystic. The triumph of Aristotelianism in theology, the rejection of reformed Christendom, the condemnation of Jansenism, and the elevation of Alphonse de Liguori to be *doctor ecclesiæ* are so many stages in the anti-Augustinian movement which to Heiler spells degeneration.

The Middle Ages are expressed in four great persons: Bernard, Aquinas, Francis and Dante. They embody the "opposites" of Catholicism—Bible and tradition, reason and faith, a legal system and the gospel, natural and supernatural,

practical Churchmanship and mysticism, and even, in Dante, heathen and Christian. Here in the thirteenth century is the ideal Catholicism for the sake of which we are patient with the reality on earth.

Against all this syncreticism Luther pits one idea, the Gospel of God's grace, Calvin another single idea, the Glory of God. Catholicism formulates its faith at the Council of Trent, but no Augustine or Aquinas appears either then or since. Instead St. Alphonse arises, to be placed by the side of Augustine, Bernard, and Thomas Aquinas as *doctor ecclesiæ!* In him paganism and Jewish legality triumph. The free criticism of the Middle Ages has come to an end. No one protests when he utters blasphemies like "It is hard through Christ but easy through Mary to be saved." It was left for the nineteenth century to put the final stones on the edifice of Catholicism by promulgating the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, the only beliefs current in the sixteenth century which the Council left unsanctioned.

II

Catholicism is made up of seven elements, each of which seems to some observers the whole. Heiler devotes considerable space to these, which are as follows: (i) *Popular Piety;* (ii) *The Religion of Legality and Meritorious Works;* (iii) *The Church as a juridical and political Institution;* (iv) *Rational Theology;* (v) *The Mystery-Liturgy;* (vi) *Monasticism;* (vii) *Mysticism.* Let us summarize his treatment of each.

(i) *Popular Piety.*—Heiler, as one would expect, makes a strong indictment here. Not that he is unsympathetic. It is all to the credit of Catholicism that it has retained the primitive elements which in Protestantism go off into sects. There are many side chapels in the great Cathedral of Catholicism. The characteristics of *Die Volksfrömmigkeit* are that it cannot realize inward forces apart from outward symbols, and it looks on religion largely as a method of getting worldly prosperity. It believes strongly in holy forces, objects and acts—all that which in comparative religion is now called *manu*, and when dangerous *tabu*. The cult of relics, less powerful than in the Middle Ages, is still strong. When they touch other things these in their turn become charged with the same force. This explains the indefinite multiplication of relics of the True Cross. Magic of all kinds is encouraged by the authorities. Amulets, scapulars and rosaries are believed to possess power in themselves. Candles are burned for the dead, to give them light by sympathetic magic. Bells are rung to drive out evil spirits.

But priests are the chief possessors of these powers. Perhaps the culminating point is reached when a priest celebrating a requiem at a privileged altar is believed to free a soul from Purgatory—*the mass being paid for.*

To the populace the Lord God is a formidable being. Christ is specially the Judge; He is lovable only in the Crucifix. Mary is the embodiment of divine mercy and grace. There is no conception of her help being confined to Intercession and as regards her worship the refinements of *latreia* and *hyperdoulia* are unknown. The great saints—Paul, John, Augustine, etc.—are almost unknown to the masses, as are the saints in the Canon. Others take their place—Joseph, Antony of Padua, and at the present time Thaddæus, who a few years ago was unknown! Supernatural images which speak, sweat blood, etc., are the plain man's way of realizing the other world. The climax of magic-sacramental belief and practice is reached when we come to "interuterine" baptism by means of a special medical instrument, to secure salvation for eternity of a child who may not survive the birth-process.*

Only a very few of Heiler's instances have been given. His conclusion is that the heavy weight with which all this superstition clogs the higher piety and theological speculation of the Church is balanced by many advantages on the other side. "The continuance of such elements secures a certain primitive growth and freshness for the religious life; the gross side of the cult protects like a strong box the tender mystery of the irrational and hinders an emptying of living piety by doctrinaire Rationalism" (235).

(ii) *The Religion of Legality.*—Belief to the Catholic is a matter of intellect rather than emotion. The average Catholic has *fides implicita* only: *fides explicita* is for theologians and comparatively few laity. The Church includes *credenda* among its laws, with regulations about morals and worship. *Theologoumena* such as the bodily assumption of the B.V.M. or the material fires of hell must be accepted, the first as a necessary conclusion from the other Marian dogmas, the second as a *sententia theologice certa*, to deny which is *sententia temeraria.*

Casuistry is the characteristic form of the moral law. It is not the official system, but since the canonization of St. Alphonse other systems have a hard struggle to survive. Reading the discussions of moralists we are back again among the Pharisees whom Jesus condemned. The whole atmosphere is alien to the Gospel. How many grammes of meat may one eat on a fast

* The reference is Capellmann, *Pastoralmedecin*, 18 Aufl. Paderborn, 1920, p. 242. The book is published with the approval of authority. This form of baptism is provided for in the new *Codex Juris Canonici*, Can. 746, 747.

day without grievous sin? One moralist says 60, a lax moralist 120. How many pages of a forbidden book may one read? The strict answer is three, the lax six. The nemesis of casuistry is scrupulosity, which is the endemic disease of Catholicism. Heiler has known a seminarist confess and receive absolution five times in one day. It is common to make one's confession on Saturday in preparation for Communion and then to be tortured with scruples which require a further confession on Sunday morning. St. Alphonse himself is a glaring example of scrupulosity; his rank as *doctor ecclesiæ* makes adequate condemnation difficult. The remedy prescribed by moralists is complete obedience to the confessor; some even recommend temporary suspension of the law—*dilige et fac quod vis.*

(iii) *The Church as a Juridical and Political Institution.*—We are not surprised to find Heiler severe at this point. He sees the primacy of St. Peter firmly established in the first century. The first, third, and four Gospels testify to it. Peter in John xxi. is "pastor ecclesiæ," taking the place of the Good Shepherd. But that this primacy meant the jurisdiction and infallibility of the Papacy was quite outside the range of ideas of the early Church. The step from an Occidental Patriarchate to an Œcumenical Primacy was taken by Leo the Great. But, he insists, the popes' "primacy was as a matter of fact not arbitrarily usurped, but a primacy of work and duty fulfilled" (296).

Heiler has hard words for the Roman Curia, "a worldly bureaucracy with strong political and diplomatic traditions" (307). We have to do with a State rather than a Church, a State immensely strong with the skill and experience of centuries. Since 1870 the kingdom has become an absolute monarchy. The new *Codex Juris Canonici* is a triumph of centralization; henceforward a bishop is only a Vicar-general of the Pope. It was received without a dissonant voice.

The sins of Rome in the past have been great. Two only need claim our attention now, lack of humility and lack of love. The contrast with the qualities demanded by Jesus in His disciples is tremendous. "How terrible at all times has been the lovelessness of the popes against those who, actuated by the deepest religious motives, have travelled to God by other ways than the Roman military road" (324). Many religious Catholics deplore the reality but are Platonists, in spite of official Aristotelianism, and see only the ideal Pope. There is a strain of tender mysticism which hardly ever finds expression in words. It sees in the Pope the visible head of Christ's mystical Body on earth, but it is a "Haupt voll Blut und

Wunden," mocked, wearing a crown of thorns. "Behind the mystery of iniquity, which is revealed in the pontificate of so many successors of Peter, shines for them the secret of secrets, the Passion of the Lord" (333). *Fulget crucis mysterium.* They dream of a *Pastor Angelicus.* Heiler dreams of him too, but he cannot share their optimism, for the present system of election means that the Curia always gets the man of its choice. As a historian he sees that the Papacy was a historical necessity. In a world Church the rule of one bishop means unity. But the form evolved by the Middle Ages is not the only possible one, just as the college of bishops of the early Church is a form which the Church outgrew.

(iv) *Rational Theology.*—By this is meant the intellectualist Aristotelian system which the new Codex has sanctioned for all time. Heiler dislikes it, though he concedes its triumphs. It teaches the reality of the divine, it has successfully beaten off subjectivism and theories of value-judgments. But everything is like a map, in two dimensions only. The famous rational proofs of God's existence, to mention one of Heiler's objections, may demonstrate the existence of the Absolute, but cannot that of the Christian's God. The dogmatic edifice is imposing, but—well, let Heiler's effective quotation complete the paragraph. "A Professor of Theology in the Jesuit University of Innsbruck closed his dogmatic lectures with these remarkable words: 'Gentlemen, this is the teaching of the Catholic Church. Whether it corresponds to reality I know not. Perhaps all is *totaliter aliter.*'"

(v) *The Liturgy.*—When Heiler reaches the Mass his tone changes. Here we have an inner piety of quite a different character from the exterior shell of law and theology; controversy is stilled before its supreme values. He calls it *Die Mysterienliturgie*, for he accepts the theory that the forms in which the idea is enshrined are of Hellenistic origin, though he thinks none the worse of them for this. He exhausts the resources of his rich style and vocabulary to describe the attractiveness of the Mass. He knows the objections of liturgical purists but brushes them aside. Theologically the Mass stands in a very strong position. For example, as regards Invocation of Saints. The position of the Saints in the Canon is all the most captious critic could wish. Popular devotions may be attacked, but not the Mass. For a Lutheran it has the supreme advantage of preaching *gratia sola.* The priest's individuality disappears, God does everything.

A fascinating account is given of the liturgical movement in Germany initiated by the Benedictines of Beuron and Maria-Laach, which more than anything else is bringing the intellectuals

of Germany back to Catholicism. Except for the Canon, which is said softly, all is audible. The whole congregation join in the responses, etc., formerly made by servers only. For congregations of students familiar with Latin this is a real people's Mass. For others a new and quite recent departure is described. A conductor leads the people's worship in the nave, saying everything in German at the same time as the celebrant says the Latin, except for the Canon. At Maria-Laach they have restored the *mensa* of the early Church. A cross is placed on the wall behind, but the celebrant says Mass standing between the wall and the altar, facing the congregation.

(vi) *Monasticism.*—We must bring this long review to an end and dismiss the important section dealing with the Catholic Orders in a few lines. After drawing the ideal picture, Heiler compares the reality and concludes that, indubitable as are the weaknesses of monasticism, they are far outweighed by the blessings it has brought in its train. He emphasizes the way in which the secular priesthood has been influenced by the monastic ideal, so that it is now semi-monastic in its life.

(vii) *Mysticism.*—That mysticism as we know it is of Neo-Platonic origin cannot be denied, but " many shall come from the east and the west and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." Only in Catholicism and attached to the Eucharist is mysticism safe. We owe an incalculable debt to the mediæval mystics. Broadly speaking the Church for its first 1,000 years had only liturgical books. From the Eucharistic mysticism of the Middle Ages we get the popular books of devotion of to-day. Not till the 16th century did this material become common property. To mediæval Passion and mysticism we owe the crucifix, *Stabat mater*, and much of our religious art. Only—Jesus was not a mystic. The complicated " ladders " and other apparatus find no support in the Gospel. It cannot be the universal way.

It is worth noting that in the English Communion Service we have, by the side of the liturgical forms derived from the old rite, certain elements, such as the Comfortable Words and Prayer of Humble Access, which represent the popular devotions which grew up in the Middle Ages.

III

In conclusion Heiler asks whether the Gospel is to be found in Catholicism, or whether it is not irretrievably buried beneath the complicated mass of deposits which have accumulated during the ages. He answers that the Gospel *is* there.

He proceeds to appreciate by way of summing up the endless riches of Catholicism, so little appreciated by many Church members. It is the heir of all the ages, of bygone religions and cultures. In it we have Jewish prophecy, cult and wisdom, Greek mystery religions and philosophy, Neoplatonism and Aristotle, Roman law and statecraft, to say nothing of primitive cults and beliefs. Catholicism is the religion of humanity. It has developed greatly in the past, and its possibilities for the future are limitless. Only, the *tempo* has slowed down. The stream has broadened out and become sluggish. Catholicism is a *complexio oppositorum*. Especially do we note its Universality contrasted with its Unity; Progress and Continuity; Tolerance and Exclusiveness. The tragedy is that the second of these pairs is at present emphasized at the expense of the first. Catholicism is not evenly proportioned and balanced.

Heiler's conclusion of the whole matter is not so clear as one would wish. But his main position seems to be this. Luther's significance lies in the fact that he extricated the Gospel from the giant-complex of Catholicism. The way shown by Jesus in the Gospel is very simple. Though Catholicism has not lost the Gospel, it must be possible to live the way of Christ without all its additions. So long as the Church says No, the protest of Evangelicalism remains necessary. " Great-hearted and universal as Roman Catholicism may be, it has never possessed the great-heartedness to tolerate a bare Evangelical Christianity in its bosom. Just because it was not possible within the great Church organization to hold fast the Gospel of Jesus in its original simplicity and child-likeness, in its unique greatness and splendour, those to whom the Gospel was all in all were forced to break loose from the Church and reveal its wonderful power to humanity outside the universal Community " (640).

" There must be heresies " is Heiler's pessimistic conclusion. But he indulges in a dream of a reunited Church, like so many others in these last years. There must be one supreme bishop to safeguard unity; the various bodies must be like a crown clustering round the great Roman Church; and Rome must learn to tolerate the simpler forms of Christianity.

IV

Some of the criticisms of the earlier book given in the Preface may fitly be quoted here, in order that the reader may realize the kind of impression made by Heiler's arguments.

Roman Catholic.

P. Lippert, S.J.: Heiler's ideal of Evangelical Catholicism is already realized in the Roman Church "if at present in seeds and tendencies, which have still to be developed to perfection."

G. Grupp thinks of Balaam, who came to curse but remained to bless.

Karl Adam speaks of Heiler's youth, his search for Evangelical Catholicism and his failure to see that the legal and official element is the necessary shell.

Romano Guardini treats it as the most dangerous attack on Catholicism since Strauss. He points out that the shrub must look different from the mustard-seed. The shrub has taken up extraneous elements to support its life; so has the Church.

Protestant.

K. Girgensohn: This is a Catholic not Evangelical position. "For German Lutheranism I know only one catchword. The Gospel pure and clear and unfalsified, and all that goes beyond this is of evil."

G. O. Sleiden: "Statistics and facts know nothing of a 'Catholic movement,' which to the disadvantage of Protestantism goes through the spiritual world to-day . . . but only of a more energetic and noisy advertising."

Kattenbusch notes how scornful a Protestant is who passes over to Roman Catholicism, how tender and forgiving a convert in the opposite direction, and concludes that Protestants have the Gospel spirit.

Conceivably the Roman controversy will be acute in England in the near future. God grant that Anglicans who feel called to take part in it will drink as deeply of the well of Gospel charity as Friedrich Heiler has done.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among contributors to this number, Mr. G. R. Driver is Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and son of the late Professor Driver; and the Rev. F. J. Badcock is Fellow of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.

Canon Wordsworth writes to point out a misprint in our last issue. On p. 54, line 9 from the foot of the text, for *flos Catinae* read *flos Cantiae*.

S.P.C.K. have lately published *Twelve Services of Family Prayer*, by A Layman. They are based on good models and well arranged, and the interleaving is most useful. We have found them admirably suited to their purpose and venture to recommend them.

A correspondent writes:

Every Diocesan Calendar has a list of clergy having the bishop's licence to officiate in the diocese; in some Southern dioceses it reaches imposing dimensions. As a matter of Church order, what is their status as regards the parish priests? Are they entirely dependent on them, so that they have a right to exercise their priesthood only in so far as the parish priest wills? Clearly they have no right to minister in church except at the invitation of the incumbent. But have they any rights as regards ministrations outside the walls of the church?

I should be grateful if some correspondent skilled in Canon Law could answer this question. These are the kind of cases I have in mind:

1. An unattached priest is asked to take a funeral in a public cemetery.
2. He is asked to take a private baptism, or to give Communion to a sick person.
3. He tries to help his friends in their spiritual life and the question of confession comes up. Is he justified in hearing confessions elsewhere than in a church by leave of the incumbent?

I am inclined to think that in the Church of England we have concentrated our attention unduly on questions of ministerial commission to the neglect of problems of jurisdiction.

Mr. Prestige tells us that the children of his Oxfordshire parish no sooner heard his *Catholic Rhymes for Christian Children* (S.S.P.P., 1d.) than they knew them by heart. We can well believe it. Here is one on Almsgiving:

> "There was a wise man who said, 'Odd,
> If the heavenly path could be trod
> By spending your cash
> Upon pleasure and trash,
> And not spending any on God.'"

NOTICES

Prayer-Book Revision and Christian Reunion. Some essentials discussed in the light of liturgical facts and principles. By Francis C. Eeles. Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d.

Mr. Eeles' book is a discussion of the principles which should be kept in view in all schemes for the reform of the Prayer-Book. He desires to rescue the matter from what he calls "the Roman obsession, positive or negative." He believes that the appeal to modern Roman authority in matters liturgical is the one enemy, and that, if only all concerned would close their eyes to the existence of the Roman liturgical books, we could live in harmony, and get on with Christian reunion.

He begins with a general discussion of the principles of ecclesiastical authority. This is followed by a statement of the problem of revision and a detailed criticism of the various schemes put forward. We then have a definite constructive proposal, to which he attaches very great importance: that individual Bishops in their Synods should undertake a detailed ordering of ceremonial, forbidding all modern ceremonies, but not insisting on ancient ones; and, further, that they should arrange for the taking of a general inventory of ornaments, with a view to the discarding of those of an un-English type, unless they were of such intrinsic value that a dispensation for their use might be granted as an exceptional concession. The last chapter, which is full of interesting information, deals with the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.

Mr. Eeles is a learned ecclesiologist, and his opinions on ecclesiastical ornaments are entitled to great respect. But it will seem to many people that to say that all ceremonial must be of the "English" type, merely on the ground that there is a rubric specifying what *ornaments* are to be used with the Prayer-Book services, is to go beyond what is written. Nor is it accurate to say that the clergy "have promised to obey . . . the ceremonial use of previous English tradition." Indeed, he is [illegible]an fair to the "Latinizers," about whose policy he allows himself a regrettable latitude of innuendo. It seems hardly reasonable to treat the *Green Book* as the outcome of a plot to Romanize our national rite, when one reason for its adoption was the honest wish to provide an Anglican form which would do away with the anomalous interpolation of the somewhat unsatisfactory Roman Canon.

There are one or two matters on which the author has surely been misinformed. There can be few priests of any standing in Anglo-Catholic circles who discourage the assistance of sacred ministers at Mass, or who "make the faithful regard the celebration of the Holy Eucharist as primarily an occasion for the adoration of our Lord as present on the altar." The trend of practice and teaching is in the opposite direction.

K. D. Mackenzie.

Spiritual Healing. By the Rev. H. Anson. University of London Press. 3s. 6d.

A thoughtfully-written book, and marked by knowledge of the practical side of the subject and by sanity of judgment. The most useful chapter is the exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's indwelling in the human heart, and of the abundance of the Christian hope. The criticism

of Christian Science is shrewd, penetrating, and kindly, and various one-sided prejudices and unconscious materialisms are deftly exposed. But when we pass from the subject proper of the book to the fundamental assumptions indicated in the earlier chapters, and to the general perspective of human life, we feel bound to point out that it is strongly affected throughout with two popular modern—and ancient—heresies. It is anthropocentric always, and very often takes it for granted that man can save himself. It is a Pelagian treatise.

To take the latter point first. At the end of Chapter II. there is a significant passage: "It is, then, at the root of all understanding of religion that we should know God aright, and worship Him intelligently. Begin, as St. John tells us to do, with our brother whom we have seen: begin by finding out what in the life you know is most truly worshipful: following that at all costs and regardless of reward; it will lead at last to your seeing that Love is God." Mr. Anson has construed 1 John iv. 20 upside-down. Taken by itself this grievously-misunderstood saying may, grammatically, give him warrant. "For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" But a glance at the context forbids the notion that man can "*begin* with" anything so glorious as brotherly love. That love is the outcome of our love of God; and "we love Him because He first loved us." Hence a correct paraphrase of the verse would be: "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, shows thereby that he has not learnt the fundamental and more difficult lesson of loving the invisible God." Moreover, the words of the Master (Mark xii. 29) make it abundantly clear that in our feverish anxiety to deal effectively with the claims of this temporal life we are forgetting those of the Most High God or treating the two as if they were identical.

As to the anthropocentric point of view, that is, in fact, Pelagianism. It is also the assumption that we can apprehend Truth by the power of our own reason, or at least enough of it to give us guidance in our task of securing temporal happiness. As long as we base our teaching on this assumption, we provoke endless controversy, and "wander out of the way in the wilderness." For a corrective we would suggest the perusal of the end of Mozley's *Essay on Blanco White*, which, like the exhortations of all our greatest and most enduring writers, is full of the feeling once far more prevailing than it is to-day,—namely, awe. Early in the book Mr. Anson indicates his leaning towards a subjective, semi-Pantheistic view of the Creator in his affirmation that Love is God. If we were dealing with mathematics, we could rest in that affirmation; for if A = B, B = A. But St. John's formula transcends all reaches of our logic, and we must beware of confusing even the very highest of the divine gifts with the mystery of the Father's revelation of Himself.

E. Lyttelton.

The Monastic Chronicler and the Early School of St. Albans. By Claude Jenkins, Lambeth Librarian. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Very modestly the author of this delightful little book calls it "a lecture"; but it is more than that. It is based on solid, independent work, and its conclusions are a distinctly original and valuable contribution to the subject; moreover, its method and its familiar and capable use of the sources are in pleasant contrast with much of the excessively simplified and popularized specimens of the historian's labours presented for public instruction and judgment.

The first twenty-two pages give a very readable and fresh account of monastic chronicles in general down to the twelfth century, with special care devoted to Bede. In the second part, attention is confined to the monastic chroniclers of St. Albans, and it is here that the author's learning and skill are most clearly seen. A thorough examination of Sir Thomas Hardy's theory of "the establishment of one chief scribe in the *Scriptorium*, the *Historiographer*," some time between 1161 and 1183, results in its rejection as "an invention, not of the latter half of the twelfth, but of the nineteenth century" (p. 67). An independent examination of the MSS. attributed to Matthew Paris leads to a striking limitation in the number of those in which Matthew's hand is to be found, and apparently entails the sacrifice of an elaborate theory of peculiar spellings associated with St. Albans. Another valuable section is that in which Roger of Wendover is studied; here, again, Professor Jenkins takes his own line, according to Roger a higher rank than that usually given him. The remarks on p. 48 about the editions of Wendover were worth making and are not too strong.

These are only a few of the interesting suggestions started by this unusually fresh and stimulating book, and we may be sure they will not go fruitless. If, after this expression of gratitude, a complaint may be lodged, it is this: the marked parsimony in punctuation-marks makes the reading rather more difficult than it need be. And surely Professor Jenkins will clarify this bad sentence on p. 17: "It would seem as foolish to reject as worthless Eadmer's *Life of St Dunstan* on the ground that it represents the devil as speaking French as Carlyle's *Frederick the Great* because of its characteristic reflections. . . ." There is an obvious misprint on p. 42.

Professor Jenkins' work has been written in the spirit of Bede—*dulce habui*—"the spirit in which the student's best work is done" (p. 5), and while the conclusions he reaches await the attention of the specialist, his zest and enthusiasm must be a delight and stimulus to any average reader or aspirant.

J. H. Baxter.

Dialogues on Metaphysics. By Malebranche. Translated by Morris Ginsberg. George Allen and Unwin. 15s.

There are few positions more difficult to fill with any dignity than that of coming immediately before or after a great original mind. Unless such man is an Aristotle following a Plato, or a Berkeley following a Locke, he is classified by the textbooks as one of a "school," who occasionally annoys his commentator and upsets the symmetry of the evolution of thought by having opinions of his own, which are absurdly premature, and can only be considered as very ineffectual attempts to throw off fetters that were not due to disappear till the next star-turn made his entry. A curious history of Philosophy might be written, which should use as its stepping-stones the names of secondary importance, and treat the more famous ones as mere epochs of transition; Socrates as an incident between Anaxagoras and Eudoxus, or Kant as paving the way from Wolf to Schelling.

In such a history, Malebranche would play an important part. He would cease to appear as a rather precocious disciple of Descartes, and would prove worth considering on his own merits. This translation assures us he would not lose by that. For a long time, he was best known

in English philosophy by a somewhat hostile reference in Berkeley's *Second Dialogue*: "I shall not be surprised if some men imagine that I run into the enthusiasm of Malebranche, though in truth I am very remote from it." But for some time now he has been recognized as having the right to an honourable mention after the triad, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz. Professor Adamson devoted a chapter to him in *The Development of Modern Philosophy*, and Martineau singled him out to furnish one of his *Types of Ethical Theory*.

The *Dialogues* are well translated, though one rather wonders why they need translation at all. There can be very few, wishing to read Malebranche, who cannot read him in the original. They are lively, and do manage with more or less success to keep up the idea of a real conversation between real people. Aristes is an attractive youth, with his wild enthusiasms and impatient rushing to wrong conclusions. Theodore is an impressive and venerable figure, though a little severe in his treatment of Aristes, and even in one or two passages a little priggish; we would not commend him as a model to young philosophical tutors, but we can hardly expect the Oxford tutorial system full-blown in seventeenth-century France. It is difficult to see why Theotimus is introduced, as he seems only to double the part of Theodore. All philosophical dialogues, if they try to be dramatic, are faced with the difficulty that you cannot have drama without development of character, and you cannot get such development without incident. Berkeley is perhaps wiser, when he keeps the dramatic interest one of argument, not of character. Like all French books, the *Dialogues*, in spite of the gravity of the subject, abound in passages of brilliance, and especially in passages illustrating the famous Cartesian clarity. Nor are there even wanting *mots*, such as this, almost worthy of Voltaire: "Become a thinker and everyone will soon desert you. The great secret for freeing oneself from the importunity of many people is to talk rationally to them."

Much of the first half of the book is an attack on the senses, and a vindication of the intelligence as the sole arbiter of truth, which is pure Plato; though Plato made religious by Plotinus, and made Christian by St. Augustine, the Ideas having now become "archetypes in the mind of God." Hence the idea of knowledge comes to be more and more thinking of the world as God does.

Malebranche, like Descartes, regards the world of the senses as not of any use for knowledge, but as of great importance for action, and, as is natural in a priest, he attaches much more importance to this world than did his master. The truths of morals are as vital to him as the truths of mathematics. These are bound up with the theory of movement, upon which all actions in this world, and therefore all ethics, are based. Here, Malebranche boldly resolves Descartes' hesitations. Since body is only extension, and mind is only thinking, and since they cannot touch, therefore so far from mind being able to move body, one body cannot even move another. All movement then comes from God. "God alone drives back the air which He has Himself made me to breathe. . . . God alone is the bond of our society. . . . Let us not abuse His power. Unhappy they who make use of it for their criminal passions!" Those last words suggest the danger of Pantheism, but it is a Pantheism tempered by the Fall and by the scarcely less convenient notion so typical of Cartesianism—that of "general laws." It is astonishing what yeoman

service this simple conception renders. God has laid down the general laws of the relation of body and mind once and for all, and He cannot really be expected (except when great miracles are called for) to make exceptions. A bad man makes a bad use of them. A good man is unjustly treated by them. Anything is better than an exception. A clear and simple law seems almost better than a just one. This argument is even invoked against Protestants. God acts by a system the same for all men; He has no private whispers for the ear of His favourites.

Much in Malebranche's theory of the Incarnation is admirable. It is based on a clear understanding of St. Paul, and the view that God can love the world utterly because it has been united to His Son leads on to Malebranche's sound definition of the Christian attitude. It is not a question of his being better than others, but of his knowing to Whom to ascribe the honour for all that is good. "Christians regard themselves and the rest of the universe as nothing in relation to God, when they protest that it is only through Jesus Christ that they enter into any relation with Him."

F. H. Brabant.

The Apocalypse of St. John. By M. G. Glazebrook. Murray. 6s.
Book of Revelation. By J. Oman. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Charles' great commentary on the Revelation can never be mentioned except in terms of the deepest respect. But he has failed to carry experts with him in his revolutionary theories. For example, Dr. Moffatt in Theology, February, 1921, showed strong reasons for scepticism. And those who cannot argue with Dr. Charles on his own ground must be pardoned if they suspend their judgment, since they have seen so much radical source-criticism of New Testament documents confidently advocated, and yet fail to establish itself. Canon Glazebrook is a disciple of Dr. Charles, and the present book expounds for the general reader the thesis of the big commentary, including the rearrangements of the text. Within its limits the work is very well done. But the value of such books is problematical. There is a danger that students who ought to be studying the conclusions, *with* the arguments on which they are based, will read the conclusions only as given by Canon Glazebrook. The writer will probably reply that this book is intended for a different public. Unfortunately that wider public is likely to get a wrong impression of the extent to which Dr. Charles' theories have won the acceptance of experts.

When the foregoing had been written, Dr. Oman's book came to hand. It is significant that an eminent theologian who has made his reputation in other fields, coming to this vexed problem with fresh eyes, can write as follows of Dr. Charles' treatment of the last three chapters: "Dr. Charles' rearrangement is sufficient disproof of his contention. It is: xx. 1-3; xxi. 9—xxii. 2, 14-15, 17; xx. 4*c h*, 4*a b i*, 5*b*, 6-14, 15; xxi. 5*a*, 4*d*, 5*b*, 1-4*c*, xxii. 3-5; xxi. 5*c*, 6*b*-8; xxii. 6-7, 18*a*, 16, 13, 12, 10, 8-9, 20-21."

Dr. Oman's thesis is that the original author wrote on separate sheets, the order of which was lost. The MS. fell into the hands of an editor or editors, who did their best in the circumstances, rearranging the matter according to their judgment, and providing glosses and the necessary connecting links. The (Gnostic) Bruce Papyrus, now at Oxford, shows

us how the MS. may have looked when it fell into the editors' hands. The sections as arranged by Dr. Oman are of equal length, a few obvious glosses having been removed, and correspond to the pages of the original MS. With this key in his hand Dr. Oman is able to rearrange the book in a logical and orderly way. Thus, after the first three chapters we proceed: *The Prophetic Call*, x. 1-10, xxii. 6-8, x. 11; *The Forces in Conflict*, xi. 1—xiv. 5; *The Fall of the Monarchies*, xv. 5—xvi. 16, xix. 11-16, xiv. 19, 20, xix. 17-21, vi. 2-17, and so on. The thesis is fascinating reading, but the antecedent improbability of our being able to rearrange so confidently is very great. Dr. Oman, like Dr. Charles, has to rely on a stupid editor; though one would imagine a man living so near the original writer would have been more qualified to sort the loose sheets of a MS. than a twentieth-century scholar. Dr. Moffatt's remarks in the review already quoted are worth repeating: "A logical, coherent outline. But apocalypses are not to be judged by logic. . . . It is impossible not to admire the dexterity and resourcefulness with which he blasts obstacles out of the way. But the expense is too great."

W. K. L. Clarke.

A Century of Anglican Theology and other Lectures. By Clement C. J. Webb, M.A., LL.D. Blackwell: Oxford. 5s.

Many of us will be grateful to Professor Webb for publishing these lectures, all bearing on the philosophy of religion, in a small volume whose value is out of all proportion to its size. It contains a series of lectures, largely historical, delivered to clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, on the relation of Anglican Theology to the general movement of European thought during the last hundred years; three lectures on Morality and Religion, delivered at King's College, London; and a University Extension lecture on Theology as the science of experience. They will not be altogether easy reading to those who have not some acquaintance with philosophy, but the study will be well repaid. Professor Webb deals with some of the greatest problems of religion with a sureness of touch which shows a master of the subject. Some will recognize in the last two sections certain lines of thought already developed in his larger books, but the first section breaks new ground. Where all is so good, it is difficult to pick out any one point for comment; but we feel bound to call attention to the challenge implied in the last lecture. Many of us are conscious of the impassable gulf that separates us from official Roman Catholic theology, in so far as the latter claims to be deduced from a certain nucleus of truth supernaturally revealed, resting on an infallible authority, and therefore above criticism or discussion. Professor Webb, we believe, points us to a better way in regarding Theology as "the endeavour to give a systematic and reasoned account of Religious Experience." How far are Anglo-Catholics, as a whole, prepared to accept his position and to carry it out in their teaching? The unity of the English Church may largely depend on the answer. Meanwhile, we hope that this book will be widely read.

E. J. Bicknell.

The Times of Saint Dunstan. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., F.B.A., Dean of Wells. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 10s. net.

The Dean of Wells is doing great and noble service to students of Early English History. Not so long ago people fancied that one or two

writers might say, of that far-off time, "All that can be known, I know it." Now continually little articles or monographs are appearing and revolutionizing our ideas about dates and places and persons. There is Mr. W. H. Stevenson, who told us many things that J. R. Green did not know. There was (alas!) Mr. Murray Beaven, whose most able and original articles Dr. Armitage Robinson eulogizes in this book. There are several others. Most of all, quite recently, there is the Dean of Wells himself, who in his studies of Worcester and Somerset and the Saxon Bishops of Wells had added most remarkably, and to many people unexpectedly, to our knowledge.

He shows that Early English history is not yet really written, and he supplies massive stones for the foundation on which it may be built up anew. *The Times of Saint Dunstan* is the Ford Lectures delivered at Oxford in 1922, and they have the notable characteristics of a great scholar's untrammelled work. They are leisurely, discursive, varied in manner or in matter, always original and satisfied only with the bed-rock of facts wherever it can be reached. New results are often reached, always at least suggested, by searching criticism. It is most important, for example, to insist, as the Dean does, on the confusion caused (when and why one cannot be sure) by the misdating in the Parker MS. of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which makes—how few writers remember it!—all the dates after 929 not to be credited, and again to call attention to the interpolations in the MSS. generally. Again, the corrections of Mr. Stevenson as to the date of the Athelstan poem (Nero A 2), and as to the meaning of the Crawford Charter, No. V., are interesting and important.

But the Dean writes not merely as a minute critic. He presents impressive pictures of Athelstan and his court, and Dunstan and his Church reforms. Of the Saint no one can now write without considering the new light which Dr. Robinson throws. He is inclined to think that the genesis of his reforms was more English than has been thought. Perhaps he a little strains his point here. He shows the connection and the divergence between Dunstan and Ethelwold (as he spells him: if Ethelwold why not Ethelstan?). The new monastic movement, the importance of Winchester and Glastonbury, of kings and bishops, are illustrated with real originality and acuteness. The analysis (as it almost is) of the *Regularis Concordia* is most useful. And as for the game, the Alea Evangelii, on which Dr. Robinson, with the aid of Mr. Gambier Parry, has spent such infinite pains, it is as amusing as it is perplexing. The book is one which every serious student of tenth-century history must read and digest.

W. H. HUTTON.

BOOK NOTES

L'Énigme de Jésus. By Paul Louis Couchoud (Extrait du *Mercure de France*, I-III-MCMXXIII.). Pp. 67.

This is a very eloquent and sincere study of the question, What do we know about Jesus—not the great figure in the mind of men, but the actual person who lived in Palestine? The answer is, nothing! We do not know whether such a person ever existed. *The Gospel according to St. Mark* is, essentially, of the same type as *The Revelation of St. John.* It gives us an account of Jesus the Spirit, as He revealed Himself in the

early Church. The incidents which appear to be terrestrial events are either dramatic interpretations of Old Testament phrases, or pictorial representations of the theology of St. Paul. The details of the Passion and death of Jesus Christ are a *mélange* of phrases and ideas from the story of the martyrdom of Stephen (to which the cowardice of St. Peter really belongs, for after that event we find the Hellenistic Christians scattered in flight, but St. Peter and his friends dwelling quietly at Jerusalem), filled out with Pauline visions and a primitive Holy Week liturgy. The documents are subjected to the kind of arbitrary criticism which could be used to prove anything. But it is all a little stale and out-of-date. It represents a re-hash of the Christ-myth theories of nineteenth-century liberalism, and an idolatrous reverence for the later, rationalistic, Loisy. No competent historian would give two thoughts to it to-day. Albrecht Schweitzer (of whom M. Couchoud has never heard) made waste-paper of it all. It is very sad.

Mithraism and Christianity. A study of Comparative Religion. By L. Patterson. Cambridge University Press. Pp. ix+102. 6s. net.

A clear and popular comparison of what is known of the practice and teaching of Mithraism with Christianity as it appears to one who interprets it almost exclusively in the light of the Old Testament prophets and Jewish apocalyptic writers. Mr. Patterson does not add much to what M. Cumont has told the learned world about Mithra, but he gives us valuable quotations from Hindu and Persian writings which illustrate the origin and early development of the great mystery religion which became the centre of the last effort of European paganism to resist the conquering Jesus.

La Robe Sans Couture. Un essai de Luthéranisme Catholique. Par Pierre Charles, S.J. Bruges, Charles Beyaert. 8 fr.

In THEOLOGY for December, 1921, Mr. L. Patterson described the modern "High Church" movement in the Lutheran Church, and reviewed some of the articles in the Review which they publish. A well-known Belgian Jesuit, a professor of theology at Louvain, has now written a fully documented account of the origins and present position of the movement, with a careful estimate of its prospects. Père Charles is very kind and sympathetic, and his criticism of the movement from the point of view of the more logical and consistent Catholicism of Rome is never unfair, even if, to an Anglican, it is not always convincing. The German High Church movement has been an organized entity for about five years. They emphasize the Church's independence of the State, and claim to be Catholic *and* Lutheran. They emphasize the conservative elements in Luther's life and teaching, and hope for the restoration of the Catholic order and life which Protestant Germany has lost. They are as emphatically "non-Roman" as were the original leaders of the Oxford Movement. They look to the "Old Catholics" (not the Jansenists of Utrecht, but the followers of Döllinger), to the amusement of our author. His main lines of criticism are, however, two. In what sense is this movement "Lutheran"? Does it attach itself to the beginning of Luther's career, or to the later developments? And Catholicism ought to mean a delighted subjection to the Apostolic See of Rome. He thinks that the future success of the movement depends on its readiness to refuse compromises, and to work out the logical implications of its

position, rather than to seek to win the crowd. Nobody who wants to keep in touch with the present currents of thought in Europe should fail to read this book. A. E. B.

ADDITIONAL NOTE (*cf. p.* 62).—This number was already in the press when the January *Interpreter* reached us. It contains an article by the Rev. R. G. Parsons on Prayer-Book Revision, in which he writes as follows:

"Those who desire the authorization of the second or 'Grey' Canon value particularly the way in which it insists (1) that in the Holy Communion we have in remembrance not only the death of our Lord, but His whole Self, incarnate, crucified, risen, ascended; (2) that the consecration of the elements is not to be thought of as effected simply by the Priest's prayer and recitation of Christ's Words of Institution, but is the act of God through His Holy Spirit in response to the prayer of the whole Church; this is emphasized by the Invocation which concludes the Prayer of Consecration; (3) that the people co-operate with the priest in the Eucharistic action, joining with him in the Lord's Prayer at the end of the Consecration Prayer; (4) that Consecration is with a view to Communion, and that the act of Communion is the climax of the service, in which we not only receive the grace which comes from participation in the life of the everliving Christ, but by virtue of His indwelling presence are enabled to offer ourselves to God as 'a holy, reasonable and living sacrifice,' offering ourselves in communion with Him, in that eternal self-offering of filial love which is the essential characteristic of the Son of God."

We are grateful to Mr. Parsons for the succinctness of his reasons. With regard to (2) enough has been said in the editorial notes. We cannot see the point of (1), seeing that both Consecration Prayers provide for an Anamnesis; unless Mr. Parsons is thinking of the reference to the Incarnation in the first clause of the "Grey Book" Canon—a reference which might surely be inserted in the other Canon. In the matter of (3) we agree entirely with Mr. Parsons that the Lord's Prayer should be said by all: though we think that the rubric should leave it optional. (4) Seems to embody the ordinary teaching of the Catholic Church; though it is here used to emphasize the value of the place assigned in our present Liturgy to the oblation of "ourselves, our souls and bodies"—viz., in the Post-Communion. In our judgment, that is a real point. It is open to the objection that to distinguish one element in the complex rhythm and action of the Eucharistic offering as more appropriate after the Communion than before it is to lay an exaggerated stress upon considerations of time in an act of worship which so far transcends time. But we should much rather accept the "Grey Book's" place for the self-oblation of the people and adapt the other Canon accordingly, than admit alternative revised Liturgies.

E. G. S.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER